

3.2 dug

The CHURCHMAN

A QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF ANGLICAN THEOLOGY

OL. LXXIII.

EIGHTIETH YEAR

NO. 2

Editorial

The Humanitarian Theory of Punishment

**The Purpose and Function of the
Thirty-Nine Articles**

**The Theology of P. T. Forsyth and
its Significance for us Today**

The Place and Purpose of the Sacraments (II)

Book Reviews

For complete list of contents see within

JUNE 1959

CHURCH BOOK ROOM PRESS LTD

DEAN WACE HOUSE, WINE OFFICE COURT, LONDON, E.C.4

2/6 per copy

10/- per annum, post free

BCMS

- *In Biblical Theology*
Conservative Evangelical
"For the Word of God, and for the testimony of Jesus Christ"
- *In Churchmanship*
Loyally Anglican
in its adherence to the Book of Common Prayer and the Thirty-nine articles
- *In Missionary Outreach*
Pioneer Evangelism and Pastoral Ministry
in the Dioceses of
NORTH AFRICA (Morocco)
SUDAN (Ethiopia)
UPPER NILE (Uganda)
CENTRAL TANGANYIKA
MOMBASA
LUCKNOW
RANGOON

Write for full particulars to:
**THE BIBLE CHURCHMEN'S
MISSIONARY SOCIETY**
49 Romney Street, London, S.W.1

THE WORD OF RECONCILIATION

— has been committed by God to the Christian Church. This means that the Ministry of the Church must have this supreme purpose controlling every impulse.

The C.P.-A.S. is wholly committed to sponsoring and supporting just such a ministry in the parishes and stands in need of your work and prayers and gifts.

CHURCH PASTORAL-AID SOCIETY



32 Fleet Street, E.C.4
Tel.: FLEet Street 4341-3

A new I.V.F. Pocket Book

THE MYSTERY OF SUFFERING

by Hugh Evan Hopkins

Sooner or later suffering comes to all. In this book the author offers no glib answer to the age-old problem but, convinced that Christians are not intended to remain as mystified as those who have no hope, he examines the problem in the light of Scripture teaching and discovers much that will bring encouragement and comfort to the deeply troubled, the sincere seekers, and to the sufferers themselves. This is not a book for the insensitive or merely curious!

128 pp.

Ready mid-June

3s. 6d.

Write for catalogue

The Inter-Varsity Fellowship
39 Bedford Square, London, W.C.1

THE CHURCHMAN

APRIL -
JUNE, 1959

Contents

Vol. LXXIII. No. 2
New Series

	PAGE
EDITORIAL	51
THE HUMANITARIAN THEORY OF PUNISHMENT C. S. Lewis, M.A., F.B.A.	55
THE PURPOSE AND FUNCTION OF THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES The Rev. Geoffrey W. Bromiley, M.A., Ph.D., D.Litt.	60
THE THEOLOGY OF P. T. FORSYTH AND ITS SIGNIFI- CANCE FOR US TODAY The Rev. Richard E. Higginson, M.A., B.D.	66
THE PLACE AND PURPOSE OF THE SACRAMENTS (II) The Editor	76
BOOK REVIEWS	
Stephen Neill: <i>Anglicanism</i>	87
D. L. Edwards: <i>Not Angels But Anglicans</i>	87
G. F. S. Gray: <i>The Anglican Communion</i>	87
S. C. Carpenter: <i>Eighteenth Century Church and People</i>	88
J. Bromley: <i>The Man of Ten Talents: A Portrait of Richard Chevenix Trench, 1807-86</i>	90
Alfred R. Shands: <i>The Liturgical Movement and the Local Church</i>	91
Werner Pelz: <i>Irreligious Reflections on the Christian Church</i>	92
A. H. Dammers: <i>Great Venture: The Church of South India in Action</i>	93
Brian Rice: <i>What is Christian Giving?</i>	94
William Wilberforce: <i>A Practical View</i>	95
Adrian Hastings: <i>Prophet and Witness in Jerusalem: A Study of the Teaching of St. Luke</i>	96
D. Martyn Lloyd-Jones: <i>Conversions Psychological and Spiritual</i>	97
E. B. Castle: <i>Moral Education in Christian Times</i>	97
W. Macneile Dixon: <i>The Human Situation</i>	98
Adam C. Welch: <i>Visions of the End: A Study in Daniel and Revelation</i>	99
J. Stafford Wright: <i>The Date of Ezra's Coming to Jerusalem and The Building of the Second Temple</i>	100
A. P. Shepherd: <i>Marriage was Made for Man</i>	100
W. Melville Capper and H. Morgan Williams: <i>Towards Christian Marriage</i>	101
G. S. Hendry: <i>The Gospel of the Incarnation</i>	102
James M. Robinson: <i>A New Quest of the Historical Jesus</i>	103
Notes on Some Other New Books	104

THE CHURCHMAN

Editor :

THE REV. PHILIP E. HUGHES, M.A., B.D., D.Litt.

The Editor welcomes manuscripts, which should be typewritten, double spaced, and on one side of the paper only. He cannot guarantee their return unless stamps are enclosed.

Books for review, manuscripts and editorial correspondence should be sent to the Editor, at

7 Wine Office Court, E.C.4

Subscriptions and all business correspondence should be addressed to the Publishers.

Price : Two Shillings and Sixpence

Annual Subscription : Ten Shillings per annum, post free.

In the U.S.A., annual subscription one dollar, payable to
The Seminary Bookstore, Virginia Theological Seminary,
Alexandria, Va., U.S.A.

Publishers :

CHURCH BOOK ROOM PRESS, LTD.

Writers in this Issue

C. S. LEWIS is Professor of Mediæval and Renaissance English in the University of Cambridge.

GEOFFREY BROMILEY is now Professor of Ecclesiastical History at Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, California.

RICHARD HIGGINSON is Vicar of Redland and Lecturer at Tyndale Hall, Bristol.

Editorial

THAT there is something wrong with Christian giving in England has been apparent for a long time. The generous manner in which, for example, church members in the U.S.A. contribute of their means, shows us up in an unfavourable light. It is right that there should be concern over this matter, and that there is a growing concern is indicated by the appearance in recent months of a number of publications on the subject (a review of one such book will be found in this issue) and now, most recently of all, by the publication of a pamphlet, sponsored by the Central Board of Finance of the Church of England, entitled *The Christian Stewardship of Money* (Church Information Board, 2s. 6d.). This pamphlet, which merits careful study, constitutes in effect a plea for direct giving as opposed to dependence on bazaars, fêtes, and sales of different kinds, from which, according to statistics, the average parish derives more than half its income. Certain tested methods of direct giving are described and commended for consideration. No doubt a variety of reasons may be assigned for the existing situation. As an organization the Church of England is becoming increasingly top-heavy, over-regimented, over-centralized, and "run", more and more impersonally, by a hierarchy of gaitered bureaucrats. The big business machine should not be expected to stimulate the springs of personal generosity. But the Church's problem is, at root, a spiritual one. It is precisely those parishes which are spiritually most vital, and are concerned even more for the needs of those who have never heard the Gospel than with their own domestic needs, that find Christian giving has ceased to be a problem. It is important, too, that our people should be instructed in the right theology of giving, such as we have in that classic passage II Cor. viii and ix. God is the first Giver : in pure grace He gave His best for us. All Christian giving should be a spontaneous, cheerful, and single-minded response to the bounty of God's prior giving. And first, like the Thessalonians, we must give our own selves, placing ourselves and all that we possess at God's disposal for the glory of His Name. In short, truly Christian giving is the expression of a truly evangelical faith. The financial problems of our parishes are symptomatic of the spiritual stagnation of our land. We can expect these problems to vanish away in proportion as our people take up the Apostle's irrepressible exclamation : " Thanks be to God for His unspeakable gift ! "

* * * *

Another pamphlet which demands attention is the Reply of the Glasgow Presbytery to the Joint Report on Relations between Anglican and Presbyterian Churches published under the title *Glasgow Speaks* (The House of Grant, 2s.) which explains with admirable cogency and clarity the reasons why the Glasgow Presbytery (and subsequently, it may be added, the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland) rejected the proposals of the Joint Report. We have no hesitation in asserting that historic Reformed Anglicanism does not contradict but supports the contentions of this booklet, and that there are great

numbers of Anglican clergy as well as laity to-day who will wholeheartedly concur with the judgment of our Presbyterian brethren that "the only realistic solution" lies in "a frank and unequivocal recognition of each other's ministries as *valid and regular ministries* of the Word and Sacraments within the Church Catholic", leading naturally to the expression of Christian unity and fellowship by the practice of intercommunion at the Lord's table ("it is *His* table, not ours"). If, with our brethren of the Church of Scotland, we believe that such action would be in accordance with "Scriptural truth", "sound reason," and "the purpose of Christ", we should not neglect to work and plan towards that end.

* * * *

It would appear, however, that this is not the belief of the bishops (some seventy of them!) who at last year's Lambeth Conference constituted the Committee on Church Unity and the Church Universal, for in their Report they assert that "it must be recognized as a fact that Anglicans conscientiously hold that the celebrant of the Eucharist should have been ordained by a bishop standing in the historic succession, and generally believe it to be their duty to bear witness to this principle by receiving Holy Communion only from those who have thus been ordained"; and they add that "the existence of this conviction as a view held among Anglicans clearly makes it in practice impossible to envisage the establishment of fully reciprocal intercommunion at any stage short of the adoption of episcopacy by the Churches of Presbyterian Order, and the satisfactory unification of the Presbyterian and Anglican ministries". An attitude as intractable as this reflects a doctrine of episcopacy not to be found in the Ordinal or Articles of the Church of England, nor is it by any means the conviction of all Anglicans that it is their duty to bear witness to the "principle" of a so-called "historic episcopate" by receiving Holy Communion only from episcopally ordained ministers. The Report, indeed, discloses what appears to be a hopeless and unscriptural divorce in the minds of the bishops between the ministry of the Word and the ministry of the Sacraments: to Presbyterian orders they would, no doubt, concede validity in the former, but not at all in the latter (that is, in the administration of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper; strangely, the disability does not apply to the administration of the sacrament of Baptism). The teaching of Scripture, however (not to mention that of the Fathers) would lead us to conclude that to sunder the ministry of the Sacraments from the ministry of the Word is more open to objection than to fail of a succession of bishops. It is identity of faith, not identity of orders, which unites God's people. Perhaps there is room for more of the spirit of the late Dr. E. C. Dewick who used to say that he welcomed every opportunity of receiving communion, in England and elsewhere, in churches other than the Church of England, of which he was an episcopally ordained presbyter, thereby bearing witness to his conviction that the universal fellowship of all believers should mean freedom to meet together in genuine communion at the very place where, above all, in obedience to the Lord's command, Christian unity should be manifested.

* * * *

Following a leading article under the title of *The Barrier* (namely, "the Anglican insistence on the principle of episcopacy") which was published in *The Times* on the opening day of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, the debate has been proceeding in the correspondence columns of that newspaper. First to appear was a letter from the Archbishop of Canterbury who, without displaying any inclination to remove or modify this barrier (indeed, seeking rather to justify it), made the welcome assertion concerning the Church of England and the Church of Scotland that "we are both within the same body of Christ, under the same Spirit, the same Lord, the same God". This was followed by letters from Dr. Nathaniel Micklem, doyen of Congregationalist scholars, and Dr. G. W. H. Lampe, who is Professor of Theology in the University of Birmingham. Dr. Micklem asks the following pertinent question: "If, as he says, the Archbishop does not question the spiritual status of the Church of Scotland, why will not or cannot he receive communion in a Scottish church?" And Professor Lampe (who is of course a clergyman of the Church of England) maintains that the Archbishop's assertion which we have cited above "must surely imply that we share the same sacraments". The logic of the conclusion he draws is, or should be, inescapable: "If, then, we acknowledge that the same Lord is truly present at His Table in both Churches, we ought to give practical effect to that recognition by some official encouragement, on the Anglican side, of the intercommunion which is already widely practised by individual communicants. . . . Such a practical demonstration of our existing unity in Christ would show that Anglicans mean what they say when they assert that they are not 'passing adverse judgment on the spiritual status of the Church of Scotland'." There is need for much more of this sort of outspoken Christian commonsense. We applaud, also, Dr. Lampe's repudiation of "the 'pipe-line' theory of the transmission of sacramental grace". It is precisely the recrudescence of this levitical theory which bedevils the whole situation, making it all the more necessary for those who repudiate it to take such steps as are open to them to break through the barrier in loyalty to the sole and unique High Priesthood of Christ our Lord.

* * * *

In this issue we are happy to be able to include an article by Professor C. S. Lewis on a subject of very considerable importance in the field of Christian sociology, particularly as our world today is threatened by novel psychological ideologies and techniques which are radically inimical to the Christian view of society and the dignity of the individual. It is not a new article, but it has not hitherto been published in this country. When it originally appeared in the Australian quarterly, *Twentieth Century*, Professor Lewis concluded with the following comment: "You may ask why I send this to an Australian periodical. The reason is simple and perhaps worth recording: I can get no hearing for it in England." The distinguished author has something to say which certainly needs to be heard and taken to heart here in England, and our reprinting of the article in *The Churchman* (with due acknowledgments) will, we trust, ensure a fair hearing for it in this country after all. In view of the noticeable fact that what

Professor Lewis calls the humanitarian theory of punishment can boast the advocacy of a variety of leaders of the different churches, it might be worth considering whether the current fashion for excluding the concepts of strict justice and satisfaction from discussion concerning the treatment of criminals may not have some definite connection with the current fashion for excluding those same concepts from the theology of the atonement, with the result that men are seen as innocent victims of heredity and environment rather than as responsible and guilty sinners before a holy God. So far from being progressive and enlightened, the theory which Professor Lewis assails is, in fact, degrading to man and subversive of his true dignity.

* * * *

With the viewpoint so incisively expressed by Professor C. S. Lewis, Dr. P. T. Forsyth would certainly have been in agreement. "There is no Divine charity but gives justice its due," he once said. "That is true for faith and true for practice. It is the principle of the Cross and the principle of the State. . . . It might be to the good of the kingdom of God if our charity toward men had to stand still a little, while we regain that justice which springs from the justice of God. Were there more justice, we should need less charity, and less of what apes charity. Have we escaped from the severity of the theologians only to succumb to the spell of the philosopher and the philanthropist? It is a poor exchange." Among modern theological thinkers P. T. Forsyth was outstanding for the creative, dynamic, and prophetic qualities of his mind. Those who want encouragement to turn attentively to his writings will find it in Mr. Higginson's appreciation of Forsyth's theology, the central emphases of which need to be heard and reaffirmed no less in our own day than in his.

Dr. Bromiley's article deals with a subject of real importance for the Church of England at this present juncture in its history. It is not so much that we are faced to-day in our Church with a flight from doctrinal and propositional religion (such a flight is perhaps more characteristic of the Free Churches) as with a retrogression to teachings and resultant practices which are ill at ease in the company of the Thirty-nine Articles. Hence "the current neglect or evasion or even defiance of the Articles" which Dr. Bromiley deplores as "one of the greatest tragedies in modern Anglicanism". With him, we wish to see the place restored to the Articles in which "they can discharge their living and salutary function".

P.E.H.

The Humanitarian Theory of Punishment

BY C. S. LEWIS

IN England we have lately had a controversy about Capital Punishment. I do not know whether a murderer is more likely to repent and make a good end on the gallows a few weeks after his trial or in the prison infirmary thirty years later. I do not know whether the fear of death is an indispensable deterrent. I need not, for the purpose of this article, decide whether it is a morally permissible deterrent. Those are questions which I propose to leave untouched. My subject is not Capital Punishment in particular, but that theory of punishment in general which the controversy showed to be almost universal among my fellow-countrymen. It may be called the Humanitarian theory. Those who hold it think that it is mild and merciful. In this I believe that they are seriously mistaken. I believe that the "Humanity" which it claims is a dangerous illusion and disguises the possibility of cruelty and injustice without end. I urge a return to the traditional or Retributive theory not solely, not even primarily, in the interests of society, but in the interests of the criminal.

According to the Humanitarian theory, to punish a man because he deserves it, and as much as he deserves, is mere revenge, and, therefore, barbarous and immoral. It is maintained that the only legitimate motives for punishing are the desire to deter others by example or to mend the criminal. When this theory is combined, as frequently happens, with the belief that all crime is more or less pathological, the idea of mending tails off into that of healing or curing, and punishment becomes therapeutic. Thus it appears at first sight that we have passed from the harsh and self-righteous notion of giving the wicked their deserts to the charitable and enlightened one of tending the psychologically sick. What could be more amiable? One little point which is taken for granted in this theory needs, however, to be made explicit. The things done to the criminal, even if they are called cures, will be just as compulsory as they were in the old days when we called them punishments. If a tendency to steal can be cured by psychotherapy, the thief will no doubt be forced to undergo the treatment. Otherwise, society cannot continue.

My contention is that this doctrine, merciful though it appears, really means that each one of us, from the moment he breaks the law, is deprived of the rights of a human being.

The reason is this. The Humanitarian theory removes from punishment the concept of desert. But the concept of desert is the only connecting link between punishment and justice. It is only as deserved or undeserved that a sentence can be just or unjust. I do not here contend that the question "Is it deserved?" is the only one we can reasonably ask about a punishment. We may very properly ask whether it is likely to deter others and to reform the criminal. But neither of these two last questions is a question about justice. There

is no sense in talking about a "just deterrent" or a "just cure". We demand of a deterrent not whether it is just but whether it will deter. We demand of a cure not whether it is just but whether it succeeds. Thus when we cease to consider what the criminal deserves and consider only what will cure him or deter others, we have tacitly removed him from the sphere of justice altogether; instead of a person, a subject of rights, we now have a mere object, a patient, a "case".

* * * *

The distinction will become clearer if we ask who will be qualified to determine sentences when sentences are no longer held to derive their propriety from the criminal's deservings. On the old view the problem of fixing the right sentence was a moral problem. Accordingly, the judge who did it was a person trained in jurisprudence; trained, that is, in a science which deals with rights and duties, and which, in origin at least, was consciously accepting guidance from the Law of Nature, and from Scripture. We must admit that in the actual penal code of most countries at most times these high originals were so much modified by local custom, class interests, and utilitarian concessions, as to be very imperfectly recognizable. But the code was never in principle, and not always in fact, beyond the control of the conscience of the society. And when (say, in eighteenth century England) actual punishments conflicted too violently with the moral sense of the community, juries refused to convict, and reform was finally brought about. This was possible because, so long as we are thinking in terms of desert, the propriety of the penal code, being a moral question, is a question on which every man has the right to an opinion, not because he follows this or that profession, but because he is simply a man, a rational animal enjoying the natural light. But all this is changed when we drop the concept of desert. The only two questions we may now ask about a punishment are whether it deters and whether it cures. But these are not questions on which anyone is entitled to have an opinion simply because he is a man. He is not entitled to an opinion even if, in addition to being a man, he should happen also to be a jurist, a Christian, and a moral theologian. For they are not questions about principle but about matter of fact; and for such *cuiquam in sua arte credendum*. Only the expert "penologist" (let barbarous things have barbarous names), in the light of previous experiment, can tell us what is likely to deter: only the psychotherapist can tell us what is likely to cure. It will be in vain for the rest of us, speaking simply as men, to say, "but this punishment is hideously unjust, hideously disproportionate to the criminal's deserts". The experts with perfect logic will reply, "but nobody was talking about deserts. No one was talking about *punishment* in your archaic vindictive sense of the word. Here are the statistics proving that this treatment deters. Here are the statistics proving that this other treatment cures. What is your trouble?"

The Humanitarian theory, then, removes sentences from the hands of jurists whom the public conscience is entitled to criticize, and places them in the hands of technical experts whose special sciences do not even employ such categories as rights or justice. It might be argued

that since this transference results from an abandonment of the old idea of punishment, and therefore, of all vindictive motives, it will be safe to leave our criminals in such hands. I will not pause to comment on the simple-minded view of fallen human nature which such a belief implies. Let us rather remember that the "cure" of criminals is to be compulsory; and let us then watch how the theory actually works in the mind of the Humanitarian. The immediate starting point of this article was a letter I read in one of our Leftist weeklies. The author was pleading that a certain sin, now treated by our laws as a crime, should henceforward be treated as a disease. And he complained that under the present system the offender, after a term in gaol, was simply let out to return to his original environment where he would probably relapse. What he complained of was not the shutting up but the letting out. On his remedial view of punishment the offender should, of course, be detained until he was cured. And of course the official straighteners are the only people who can say when that is. The first result of the Humanitarian theory is, therefore, to substitute for a definite sentence (reflecting to some extent the community's moral judgment on the degree of ill-desert involved) an indefinite sentence terminable only by the word of those experts—and they are not experts in moral theology nor even in the Law of Nature—who inflict it. Which of us, if he stood in the dock, would not prefer to be tried by the old system?

It may be said that by the continued use of the word punishment and the use of the verb "inflict" I am misrepresenting Humanitarians. They are not punishing, not inflicting, only healing. But do not let us be deceived by a name. To be taken without consent from my home and friends; to lose my liberty; to undergo all those assaults on my personality which modern psychotherapy knows how to deliver; to be re-made after some pattern of "normality" hatched in a Viennese laboratory to which I never professed allegiance; to know that this process will never end until either my captors have succeeded or I grown wise enough to cheat them with apparent success—who cares whether this is called punishment or not? That it includes most of the elements for which any punishment is feared—shame, exile, bondage, and years eaten by the locust—is obvious. Only enormous ill-desert could justify it; but ill-desert is the very conception which the Humanitarian theory has thrown overboard.

* * * *

If we turn from the curative to the deterrent justification of punishment we shall find the new theory even more alarming. When you punish a man *in terrorem*, make of him an "example" to others, you are admittedly using him as a means to an end; someone else's end. This, in itself, would be a very wicked thing to do. On the classical theory of punishment it was of course justified on the ground that the man deserved it. That was assumed to be established before any question of "making him an example" arose. You then, as the saying is, killed two birds with one stone; in the process of giving him what he deserved you set an example to others. But take away desert and the whole morality of the punishment disappears. Why, in

heaven's name, am I to be sacrificed to the good of society in this way—unless, of course, I deserve it?

But that is not the worst. If the justification of exemplary punishment is not to be based on desert but solely on its efficacy as a deterrent, it is not absolutely necessary that the man we punish should even have committed the crime. The deterrent effect demands that the public should draw the moral, "If we do such an act we shall suffer like that man." The punishment of a man actually guilty whom the public think innocent will not have the desired effect; the punishment of a man actually innocent will, provided the public think him guilty. But every modern State has powers which make it easy to fake a trial. When a victim is urgently needed for exemplary purposes and a guilty victim cannot be found, all the purposes of deterrence will be equally served by the punishment (call it "cure" if you prefer) of an innocent victim, provided that the public can be cheated into thinking him guilty. It is no use to ask me why I assume that our rulers will be so wicked. The punishment of an innocent, that is, an undeserving man, is wicked only if we grant the traditional view that righteous punishment means deserved punishment. Once we have abandoned that criterion, all punishments have to be justified, if at all, on other grounds that have nothing to do with desert. Where the punishment of the innocent can be justified on those grounds (and it could in some cases be justified as a deterrent) it will be no less moral than any other punishment. Any distaste for it on the part of a Humanitarian will be merely a hang-over from the Retributive theory.

It is, indeed, important to notice that my argument so far supposes no evil intentions on the part of the Humanitarian and considers only what is involved in the logic of his position. My contention is that good men (not bad men) consistently acting upon that position would act as cruelly and unjustly as the greatest tyrants. They might in some respects act even worse. Of all tyrannies a tyranny sincerely exercised for the good of its victims may be the most oppressive. It may be better to live under robber barons than under omnipotent moral busybodies. The robber baron's cruelty may sometimes sleep, his cupidity may at some point be satiated; but those who torment us for our own good will torment us without end, for they do so with the approval of their own conscience. They may be more likely to go to heaven yet at the same time likelier to make a hell of earth. Their very kindness stings with intolerable insult. To be "cured" against one's will and cured of states which we may not regard as disease is to be put on a level with those who have not yet reached the age of reason or those who never will; to be classed with infants, imbeciles, and domestic animals. But to be punished, however severely, because we have deserved it, because we "ought to have known better", is to be treated as a human person made in God's image.

In reality, however, we must face the possibility of bad rulers armed with a Humanitarian theory of punishment. A great many popular blue prints for a Christian society are merely what the Elizabethans called "eggs in moonshine" because they assume that the whole society is Christian or that the Christians are in control. This is not so in most contemporary States. Even if it were, our rulers would

still be fallen men, and, therefore, neither very wise nor very good. As it is, they will usually be unbelievers. And since wisdom and virtue are not the only nor the commonest qualifications for a place in the government, they will not often be even the best unbelievers.

* * * *

The practical problem of Christian politics is not that of drawing up schemes for a Christian society, but that of living as innocently as we can with unbelieving fellow-subjects under unbelieving rulers who will never be perfectly wise and good and who will sometimes be very wicked and very foolish. And when they are wicked the Humanitarian theory of punishment will put in their hands a finer instrument of tyranny than wickedness ever had before. For if crime and disease are to be regarded as the same thing, it follows that any state of mind which our masters choose to call "disease" can be treated as crime; and compulsorily cured. It will be vain to plead that states of mind which displease government need not always involve moral turpitude and do not therefore always deserve forfeiture of liberty. For our masters will not be using the concepts of desert and punishment but those of disease and cure. We know that one school of psychology already regards religion as a neurosis. When this particular neurosis becomes inconvenient to government, what is to hinder government from proceeding to "cure" it? Such "cure" will, of course, be compulsory; but under the Humanitarian theory it will not be called by the shocking name of persecution. No one will blame us for being Christian, no one will hate us, no one will revile us. The new Nero will approach us with the silky manners of a doctor, and though all will be in fact as compulsory as the *tunica molesta* or Smithfield or Tyburn, all will go on within the unemotional therapeutic sphere where words like "right" and "wrong" or "freedom" and "slavery" are never heard. And thus when the command is given, every prominent Christian in the land may vanish overnight into Institutions for the Treatment of the Ideologically Unsound, and it will rest with the expert gaolers to say when (if ever) they are to re-emerge. But it will not be persecution. Even if the treatment is painful, even if it is life-long, even if it is fatal, that will be only a regrettable accident; the intention was purely therapeutic. Even as in ordinary medicine there were painful operations and fatal operations, so in this. But because they are "treatment", not punishment, they can be criticized only by fellow-experts and on technical grounds, never by men as men and on grounds of justice.

That is why I think it essential to oppose the Humanitarian theory of punishment, root and branch, wherever we encounter it. It carries on its front a semblance of mercy which is wholly false. That is how it can deceive men of goodwill. The error began, perhaps, with Shelley's statement that the distinction between mercy and justice was invented in the courts of tyrants. It sounds noble, and was indeed the error of a noble mind. But the distinction is essential. The older view was that mercy "tempered" justice, or (on the highest level of all) that mercy and justice had met and kissed. The essential act of mercy was to pardon; and pardon in its very essence involves the

recognition of guilt and ill-desert in the recipient. If crime is only a disease which needs cure, not sin which deserves punishment, it cannot be pardoned. How can you pardon a man for having a gumboil or a club foot? But the Humanitarian theory wants simply to abolish justice and substitute mercy for it. This means that you start being "kind" to people before you have considered their rights, and then force upon them supposed kindnesses which they in fact had a right to refuse, and finally kindnesses which no one but you will recognize as kindnesses and which the recipient will feel as abominable cruelties. You have overshot the mark. Mercy, detached from justice, grows unmerciful. That is the important paradox. As there are plants which will flourish only in mountain soil, so it appears that mercy will flower only when it grows in the crannies of the rock of justice: transplanted to the marshlands of mere Humanitarianism, it becomes a man-eating weed, all the more dangerous because it is still called by the same name as the mountain variety. But we ought long ago to have learned our lesson. We should be too old now to be deceived by those humane pretensions which have served to usher in every cruelty of the revolutionary period in which we live. These are the "precious balms" which will "break our heads".

There is a fine sentence in Bunyan: "It came burning hot into my mind, whatever he said, and however he flattered, when he got me home to his house, he would sell me for a slave." There is a fine couplet, too, in John Ball:

Be ware ere ye be woe;
Know your friend from your foe.

The Purpose and Function of the Thirty-nine Articles

BY GEOFFREY W. BROMILEY

EXTERNALLY the Church of England, and the majority of Anglican Churches, are marked by a clear doctrinal attitude. Ministers accept allegiance to a distinct statement of faith. They declare this allegiance when they are instituted to office. Indeed, in their ordination they undertake to "minister the doctrine of Christ . . . as this Church hath received the same". In these circumstances it might be expected that, granted a healthy and legitimate divergence in points of interpretation, both Anglicans and non-Anglicans should know without unreasonable ambiguity what is Anglican teaching and what is not, and that the Articles enshrining and attesting this teaching should hold a place of true honour in the life and thinking of the Church.

Instead, modern Anglicanism presents a picture of sorry confusion to the non-Anglican world. Conflicting statements are made, all claiming to represent the genuine Anglican position. Pulpits are centres of the most diverse propaganda. No one but the historian

knows what is Anglican doctrine in the official sense, and the historians themselves are capable of reading back modern conflicts and contentions into the canonical documents. For the most part the Articles which are nominally accepted are ignored, evaded, reinterpreted, or dismissed as irrelevant. Pride is even taken in the fact that Anglicans can believe and teach more or less anything or nothing as seems right in their own opinion. The strange suggestion is even made that the framers of the Articles had something of this confusion in view, and consciously worded their statements with such looseness or flexibility as to make it possible. The decay of genuine dogmatics in the Church is a not unexpected consequence. Such basic theology as there is tends for the most part away from the real Anglican tradition, and debases itself by evading rather than confronting the challenge of the confession and the summons to real doctrinal succession.

In these circumstances, it is obvious that much serious thinking needs to be done by honest and conscientious Anglicans in relation to the Articles which their Church and Churches profess. A mere insistence on the letter is not enough. Confessions are not to be treated as legal documents binding all who accept them to the detailed minutiae of the letter. Attempts to use the Articles for the purpose of heresy trials can hardly succeed, and should not be undertaken. The mere insistence that this is the code and all must abide by it is unlikely to be effective when the code itself derives from so distant a period and the habit of disregarding it is so strongly entrenched. What is required is rather some more basic thinking as to the original purpose of the Articles and their continuing function. For what reason were they really drawn up in the first place? How can they be used in the Church in such a way as to maintain a continuing and distinctive teaching, yet not to bring about a stultification of and even irrelevance to changing issues and emphases? It is by pressing this type of investigation that those who both desire the dogmatic health and unity of their Church, and value the Articles themselves as an attempt in this direction, can best serve in the modern period of neglect and confusion.

* * * *

With regard to the purpose of the Articles the matter seems to be plain enough, and there is a striking relevance to the modern situation. When Cranmer first drafted them for his own diocese in 1549 the Church was filled with discordant voices. Standards had already been published in such varying documents as the Ten Articles, the *Bishop's Book*, the Six Articles and the *King's Book*. But the minority of Edward VI had brought a period of greater freedom. The leaders themselves were in a process of reconstruction which made the existing formulæ inadequate and impossible. Resistance to change was vocal amongst the supporters of the old order. Others were pressing for reform in different directions. From the councils of the nation to the pulpits of licensed preachers there was the clash of warring opinions which served little to the edification of the flock of Christ. In these circumstances it was imperative that order should be created out of confusion, at least in public statement and utterance; and the diocesan articles adopted nationally in 1553 as the Forty-two Articles, and

finally as the Thirty-nine, were to be the instrument for the creation of this order.

Now it is obvious that Cranmer was not attempting a fully developed statement on every point of Christian doctrine. Nor can he have intended, any more than Henry before him, to force all the clergy to hold the same views in every respect, to forbid free discussion, to hamper the continued testing of received doctrine by Holy Scripture, or to arrest the whole movement of theological debate. What was intended was more modest, direct, and practical. For the good of the Church the Church must attain a common mind on its great doctrines, and particularly on disputed issues of the day. Licensed preachers should then assent to this and be prepared to abide by it in their public teaching and utterances until there should be modifications through the properly appointed channels. In this way public theological conflict should be checked. The pulpit would no longer be made an instrument for the propagation of private or party opinions. The people within England, and the Churches without, could know what the general doctrinal position was, and confusion and strife could be avoided. In other words, the kind of situation which has now arisen through neglect or evasion of the Articles, and which is neither necessary for real theological vitality, nor conducive to the good of the Church at home, nor its high esteem abroad, could be checked and corrected.¹

It has often been noted that, whereas the Articles state the main doctrines and take a definite position in relation to such matters as justification and the sacraments, they do not attempt too detailed or narrow a definition. In this respect they are less like Trent and the Westminster Confession, but closer to many contemporary Reformed confessions. Cranmer himself had no desire to repeat the Roman error of making certain strictly defined tenets essential to salvation, or even to good standing in the Church. He realized that there must be freedom from rigidity in order that the Bible itself should be truly sovereign. In the last resort he once stated that he would word his doctrine only in the actual words of Scripture and the fathers, not even in his own most carefully drafted expositions.² He did not wish to fetter the private thinking of men, nor to claim that new things cannot be revealed in response to new situations or in relation to new issues. The Reformation itself was a dynamic movement, and the Articles themselves attained their present form only after rethinking and revision in which there was no sense of disloyalty to the past. To this extent, it may be claimed that there is a degree of caution or even comprehensiveness in what is stated.

Yet we must not exaggerate. Against the background of the time it is obviously a comprehensiveness only within the definite setting not merely of a Reformation understanding but a distinctively Reformed. Of the variant groups of the period, the minister wishing to preach Anabaptism could not possibly retain his licence, though he might just conceivably hold both licence and Anabaptism if he were willing to keep the latter to himself and his private thinking and dis-

¹ On this point cf. Cranmer, *Works* (Parker Society), Vol. II, pp. 440f.

² *Works*, Vol. II, p. 227.

cussion. A Lutheran could be tolerated in the earlier period, and especially in the first years of Elizabeth when there was a serious attempt made to commit the Church of England to Ubiquitarianism.¹ But with the adoption of Article XXIX there could be no public preaching of Ubiquitarianism in the English Church, and the Lutherans must either be silent or be silenced. The case was less ambiguous with those who clung to traditional teaching either as codified at Trent or in one or other of its pre-Tridentine forms. They could be licensed only if they were prepared publicly to proclaim a teaching very different from their own, and to refrain from any attempt to propagate the views which they really held. In point of fact, so great a contradiction was involved at this point that men who understood the issues, like the Marian bishops, found it quite impossible to retain both their theological integrity and their positions, and, while it is not impossible that some of those who turned, or even turned again, under Elizabeth, may have remained secret traditionalists, even these men realized that the open proclamation of their views did not fall within the envisaged comprehension.

Further light is shed on this matter by the Puritan campaign which led to the declaration under Charles I. Some Puritans, of course, were openly dissatisfied with the Articles. Others, like their successors of different persuasions, tried to read into them their own variant or more distinctive interpretations, for example, in such matters as predestination. But even this reading in of possible interpretations was regarded by the declaration as going beyond the permissible limits of comprehension. With a little ingenuity, almost any view can be foisted upon almost any statement. The Articles, however, were to be taken only in their literal and grammatical sense. To determine this is not always quite so easy to-day as it was perhaps three or four hundred years ago. But it is not allowable to strain the wording in order that it may bear an interpretation which is possible but hardly the original or natural meaning. Newman's famous handling of the Articles in Tract 90 would have received short shrift at the hands of the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, and his transition to Rome would have been more swift and clear-cut, and less mischievous, in consequence.

In other words, there is a comprehensiveness about the Articles, but it is confined to a certain area and it also cuts both ways. Some doctrines are plainly ruled out for the purposes of public utterance. No freedom is given to link the wording with a new and perhaps strained interpretation. The official doctrine is laid down in words which are plain even though they do not aim at too constricting an exactitude. Freedom is left for personal reflection and discussion, perhaps even with a view to further revision of the Articles. But in public instruction, and the witness and relationship to other Churches, this is what the Church of England and all loyal Anglican Churches accept, preach, and maintain until further order is constitutionally taken.

* * * *

The function of the Articles grows naturally out of their purpose,

¹ Cf. Jewel, *Works* (Parker Society), Vol. IV, pp. 1261, 1264.

and it will be seen that they still have a vital and positive function if only there can be found churchmen who are sufficiently informed and conscientious to allow them to exercise it. Indeed, even when churchmen of this kind are lacking, the Articles can still perform something of their work by the retarding influence which they exercise as a standard which has been officially approved and which can be amended or discarded only by great effort. In these circumstances, however, the negative aspects necessarily predominate, and the Articles are primarily an obstacle. What is more to be desired is that they should play the positive and dynamic rôle for which they are no less adapted.

In positive terms, their first function is to preserve the dogmatic order of the Anglican Church and communion. This has its negative implications. It means that mere individualism or schismatic preaching and action are kept in check. But the underlying purpose is the positive promotion of order and edification through the instrumentality of good and accepted doctrine. The ordinary members of a Church can only be confused and hampered when subjected to discordant and often erroneous voices. They can be truly instructed and strengthened when what is preached and taught is informed by the confessional standard, and arbitrary deviations are kept to a minimum.

The second function of the Articles is to exercise a purifying influence on liturgical and canonical action. Here, too, the function is critical, that is, to expose and expel that which is contrary to accepted teaching. But the purpose of the Articles is not merely to sanctify the traditional. New modes of worship and action are demanded in response to new situations. These can be tested by the Articles, but they can also be informed and suggested by the Articles, so as best to bring out that for which Anglicanism stands in dogmatic interpretation. In this connection, it is to be emphasized that liturgy and canons are not instruments for the surreptitious introduction of new or conflicting articles of faith. They necessarily stand under the dogmatic norm, and no good can come from theoretical or practical evasions of this truth.

The third function of the Articles is to pose the question of seriousness to those individuals or groups who in legitimate discussion wish to bring in new teachings or to amend the old. Before they can glibly speak of the new Anglican position, they must face the challenge of the Articles. Have they carried the whole Church with them to the point that revision or addition is now demanded? Or are they only a noisy sect claiming to speak for the whole Church but evading the real work of convincing and carrying with them the Church? Do they represent genuine and lasting insights, or merely a temporary and ephemeral theological fad? No movement can claim truly to represent the Church until it has honestly faced and satisfactorily measured up to this challenge.

More positively, the fourth function of the Articles is to provide a framework within which discussion can go forward, new issues can be taken up, and new teachings perhaps formulated, without sacrificing the formulations of the past or disrupting the continuity of the Church's witness. In relation to official utterance, the Articles are in some degree restrictive. But this does not preclude theological debate and

discussion. On the contrary it is a spur to it. Only that which is true should be demanded in public utterance. There is no place for irresponsibility in the work of the ministry. Hence it is vitally necessary that the beliefs stated in the Articles, or others which may suggest themselves, should be weighed with the utmost seriousness before they can be advanced and taught as the accepted teaching of the Church. Properly understood, this is not a restriction of theological freedom. What is excluded is the bondage of irresponsible and frivolous individualism. The freedom of serious discussion is safeguarded and fostered.

Fifth, and finally, the Articles pose an ultimate challenge by their own acceptance of the biblical and therefore the apostolic norm which is the test of the only true catholicity. This is closely linked with the freedom of serious discussion to which reference has already been made. The Articles are a genuine attempt to state scriptural doctrine on leading issues. But they do not usurp the place of Scripture. By their own confession, they are themselves subject to the lordship of God's Word. This means that they call for constant scrutiny in accordance with Scripture. Perhaps some things are wrongly stated. Perhaps others ought not to be there at all. Perhaps important biblical truths are left out, possibly because their relevance was not seen at the time of compilation. Perhaps the emphases are distorted. On the other hand, suggested revisions, additions, or subtractions must be brought under the same scrutiny in order that the teaching of the Church of England should not be that of individual theologians, nor ecclesiastics, nor parties, nor even this whole Church, but the teaching which is apostolic and therefore catholic, and which as such will truly promote saving faith and growth in grace. Here again, the function is from one standpoint critical and negative. Yet it must be conceived positively as well. The Articles summon us to the constant task of seeking and stating genuine evangelical truth and of making this the accepted standard of our preaching and teaching.

The current neglect or evasion or even defiance of the Articles is one of the greatest tragedies in modern Anglicanism. As they were conceived in the first instance, they gave hope of promoting both the unity in truth and the freedom under authority which are so necessary to the well-being of the Church. In spite of every obstacle, they have not wholly failed of their purpose. But quite obviously they cannot to-day exercise their functions in the fruitful way which could mean so much not only for doctrinal but for spiritual and disciplinary health. No matter is more urgent than that glib misconceptions should be removed, the true historical purpose of the Articles appreciated, and the place restored to them in which positively and constructively, as well as negatively and critically, they can discharge their living and salutary function.

The Theology of P. T. Forsyth and its Significance for us Today

BY RICHARD E. HIGGINSON

PETER TAYLOR FORSYTH, one time Principal of Hackney College, London, was one of the most challenging, and possibly the greatest *theologian*, especially in the sphere of dogmatics, in Great Britain this century. After a temporary eclipse he has come into his own again since the centenary of his birth in 1948 and the reprint of some of his books by the Independent Press. Yet he has never been appreciated at his true worth because the obscurities in his style and the arresting nature of his ideas have never been in step with the prevailing fashion in theology. Unfortunately for him he did not live in an age which was concerned with theology as such. The popular taste preferred something less realistic than he could give, or would do so. In the scientific field he was also out of step because the scholars working therein were engaged in other interests than his own. He lived in the heyday of higher criticism, and while not despising it as a necessary medium for preparing the ground for dogmatic reconstruction, he felt that the finest critic was often incapacitated from rendering service to theology by his preoccupation with preliminaries. He lived in a day when men's minds were wrapped up in the doctrine of the Fatherhood of God. Forsyth was in continual opposition to the way in which this biblical doctrine was held by his colleagues. His grasp of moral realities was greater than theirs and he did not conceive it as an obvious doctrine. It depended entirely upon the place Jesus Christ occupied in the scheme of things. Christology could not be treated as a matter of subordinate moment. It imperilled soteriology, which is central to the Gospel. Forsyth supplied what the churches needed, but not what they wanted. In this sense he was, to use Dr. J. K. Mozley's description, "a prophetic theologian". His contemporaries failed to realize the fact and he was left out in the cold. He was big enough, and humble enough, for the task of challenging the liberal tendencies of his day without belonging to the obscurantist camp. When the "*New Theology*" was all the rage its chief challenge came from Forsyth who pointed out that a real knowledge of the theology was the indispensable requirement for a revision of theology. This factor his opponents lacked in no small measure. Before he ended his life's work, discerning scholars were beginning to note his real worth, but it was left to this era to pay him lip service.

* * * *

Forsyth never wrote a formal treatise and it is impossible to sketch his thought as though it were a logical and coherent system. Yet there are few loose ends to his thinking. The three books which approach orderliness are *The Principle of Authority*, which is a monumental work demanding close attention and patient study; *The Justification of God*, which is a statement of a Christian theodicy, written during the first world war when the question uppermost in the

minds of many was simply, "Why did God allow it?" ; and *The Person and Place of Jesus Christ*, possibly the greatest of his books and one worthy of study by all, whether lay or cleric, student or pastor, theologian or inquirer.

The distinctive feature in Christianity in the eyes of Forsyth was the Gospel. Nowhere does he give such a declaration of its greatness as in *Positive Preaching and Modern Mind*, the Yale Lectures for 1907. His own generation was engrossed by such categories as the Bible and the Church, the individual and society. His concern was with the Gospel which created the Church and sustained it, and was the controlling principle in the Bible for which it existed as a book, to convey to all generations the good news of salvation in Christ Jesus. Through the Gospel the individual was recreated and made into a true member of Society, which needed such a dynamic transformation of its members to save it from disintegration.

He produced a popular work, in conjunction with Dr. Munro Gibson, on the nature of the Bible, but his most serious contribution to the subject was written for the *Hibbert Journal*, October, 1911, entitled "Revelation and Bible". He began by suggesting that the old method of handling the Bible had broken down through the newer methods of historical criticism. It could no longer be regarded as an inerrant text-book, and revelation could not be equated with the words of Scripture. Rather he viewed the Bible as a necessary medium for the preservation of the record and the propagation of the Gospel. The Bible was the outward and visible sign, the Gospel the inward and spiritual grace. "The Bible is at once a document of man's religion and, more inwardly and deeply, a form of God's word, and the chief form that we now have ; but it wears a human and historic shape, it is not immune from weakness, limitations, and error. The Bible is the great sacrament of the Word, wherein the elements may perish if only the Word itself endure." It is easy enough to *assert* such things, it is not so easy to *ascertain* such things.

God's redeeming action in Christ Jesus, by which He reveals His holy love and grace to guilty man, has its enduring witness in the Bible and in the Church. The company of all faithful people are as vital to the preservation and proclamation of the Gospel as the Bible is, only in a different way. Ministry and Sacraments both prolonged God's great ACT, the redemption of the world, by conveying it and portraying it in preaching and rites. This concern for the true nature of the *Church* was completely out of fashion in Forsyth's era. His colleagues were engrossed with the idea of the coming of the Kingdom of God. They had little time and thought for the Church with its dogmatic creed. They were working for the Kingdom and pressing individuals to enter it, but such atomistic individualism was foreign to the Gospel. Christ died to redeem the world, He represented the race in His agony on Calvary. "It was the race that Christ redeemed, and not a mere bouquet of believers. It was a Church He saved, and not a certain pale of souls. Each soul is saved in a universal and corporate salvation. To be a Christian is not to attach one's salvation to a grand individual, but it is to enter Christ ; and to enter Christ is in the same act to enter the Church which is in Christ" (*The Church and*

Sacraments, p. 40). His grasp of the Church principle was different from that of his Free Church colleagues. In that decade the Church was regarded as a religious club, or a coterie of likeminded pious people. In this Forsyth respected the Church of Rome which had not lost its conception of the Church in that of the Kingdom as the Free Churches of his day had. For him the Church was the Kingdom of God in the making, the scaffolding for the erection of the final structure.

In a decade that viewed the Sacraments as mere signs and means of recalling Christ's Passion he stated a positive doctrine in relation to them. They were actions setting forth the Gospel and preaching the Cross. Yet his treatment is more brilliant than satisfying on the whole, and lacks that historical examination of questions which are rooted in events, and cannot be described solely in a scintillating phrase. His handling of this subject belongs more to *ideas*, suggestive and valuable in the extreme, but merely ideas for all that. He protested against reducing the two sacraments to "memorial rites", and dismissed the idea of the sacrament as heavenly food as too theosophic, and limited his conception to the *Word Visible* aspect. Preaching he would include as the other great sacrament. Through the medium of man's word God uttered His own significant word to the believing soul. By its instrument Christ became contemporaneous as the Spirit spoke to the conscience of its guilt and need, and of the offer of pardon in a Saviour crucified and risen.

* * * *

Dr. Sydney Cave, in his tribute to his master, has a touching yet telling testimony to give. He says: "In the clarification of my thought I owe much to theologians, but Dr. Forsyth has been to me much more than a great theologian. In the faith, of which theology is the expression, I owe to him a debt I owe to none except my parents. They led me in childhood to that knowledge of Christ which is life's best possession, but it was from Dr. Forsyth that I learned to realize the holiness of God, the infinite condescension of divine grace, and the strange and humbling experience of God's forgiveness, so that devotion to Christ as a beloved Master passed into, and remains, an awed and grateful faith in God whose holiness and power are manifested in Christ's Cross and Resurrection." This brings us to the heart of Forsyth's message. He was a prophet of the Cross. No one in modern times has penetrated nearly so far into the moral reality of the Cross as he did. "Christ was driven by His experience to recognize that the crowning thing He came for was to die" (*The Cruciality of the Cross*, p. 83). The theology of the atonement meant ethic at its intensest. The Cross was the moral and religious centre of the world. It was God's own act. Nothing so clearly revealed the holiness of God, who judged sin and redeemed the sinner in the act of reconciliation through the Cross of Christ. Forsyth did not merely reiterate the penal theory of the atonement; he gave it new life and meaning and emphasis. His concern was to do justice to the unshakeable foundation of justification by faith in Christ alone. Hence his stress upon the "finished work" of Christ upon the Cross. The salvation of the race, of the Church, and of the individual (in that order) was grounded

in this strange act of God in Christ at Calvary. As Dr. H. F. Lovell Cocks says : " It was the lack of this note that made theology of his day so impotent to speak to nations or to achieve anything beyond ambulance work." The Cross is the vindication of the moral order of the universe. Indeed, it is its source.

Why must holiness be satisfied before love can forgive? Forsyth is emphatic that the work is of God. Christ is not interposed between the stricken sinner and the divine thunderbolts. There is no question of playing off the attributes the one against the other. Divine love did not mollify divine holiness. The love that saves us is *holy love*. God in His holiness secures the moral order of the universe by judging sin in the person of the Son of His love. Christ as the suffering servant is God's gift to the world, but given through the willingness of the Son to do the will of His Father. This is grace in action so that salvation is not mere salvage work, but the most radical thing in the world. We are not saved unless the Creator saves us. The omnipotent God acts in love and holiness at Calvary, where He hallows His holy Name by dealing with *sin*. " Christ bore God's penalty on sin. That penalty was not lifted even when the Son of God passed through it." " The atoning thing being the holy obedience to the Holy, the same holiness which satisfies God, sanctifies us " (*The Work of Christ*, p. 222). This " holiness of Christ was the one thing damnatory to the Satanic power. And it was His death which consummated that holiness. It was His death, therefore, that was Satan's final doom . . . and what we call the last judgment is only the completion of the deadly judgment passed on collective evil in the Cross " (*Missions in State and Church*).

We may thus summarize the section : an ethical atonement is secured by holy love in action for the redemption of man from his lost estate. Where there is holiness there must be judgment. The whole moral crisis comes to a head in the opposition between God's holiness and the sin of the world. There is the *divine* necessity for a cross. " The sacrifice is the result of God's grace and not its cause. It is given *by* God before it is given to Him " (*The Cruciality of the Cross*, pp. 52f.). The same note is sounded again in *The Work of Christ* : " The real meaning of an objective atonement is that God Himself made the complete sacrifice. The real objectivity of the atonement is not that it was made to God, but by God. It was atonement made by God, not by man " (p. 92).

* * * *

Most modern works, in dealing with the atonement, stress the inclusive humanity of Christ. As man He was offering to God what man could not offer by way of penitence and satisfaction. The confusion existing to-day in sacramental theology in the Church of England is due to misunderstanding at this point. There is too close an identification of Christ with His Church, without the corresponding truth of His difference from us being stressed, or recognized. " Christ is more precious to us by what distinguishes Him from us than by what identifies Him with us " (*The Principle of Authority*, p. 207). This aspect is not congenial to mid-century churchmen as it was not to the first

decade of Free Churchmen in this present century. Forsyth is not only concerned about atonement and its centrality to the Christian faith and the faith of the Christian, but he is also concerned with Christology. A true doctrine of Christ's Person is imperative to a proper understanding of His work. It is a tragedy that students of theology in their college course do not read Forsyth's masterpiece, *The Person and Place of Jesus Christ*. Its greatness cannot be disputed, even though it does not handle the subject from an examination point of view, nor provide ready answers to the questions it raises. There is a solemn grandeur in his handling of this majestic theme which never fails to arrest the thoughtful reader whenever he turns afresh to the book for guidance. His best work went into the making of it, and he does justice to the best interests of both theology and religion in it. It is impossible, he argues, to find the secret of Christ's greatness in His teaching about the fatherhood of God and His ethical demands on the soul. With such themes the churches of his day were more than preoccupied. This line is weak because it does not face the full content of Christ's own self-consciousness, that is, His sense of mission, of finality, of revelation, and the atoning work of His cross is omitted simply because He could not speak to His apostles of that which remained to be accomplished. Through them He spoke to the world of its final meaning and perennial power. When Forsyth treats the pre-existence of Christ he does not follow the well worn track of patristic theology and grapple with the nature of the Logos. He interprets Christ pre-incarnate through the categories of Sonship, as did the apostles and the wise master builders who followed them. No belief does justice to Christ as the Divine Son, in time and in eternity, which lays its stress elsewhere. This fact has been vindicated in the *life* of the ongoing Church as well as its most vigorous *thought*. In dealing with the problem set by the incarnate life of the Son of God, Forsyth breaks new ground. Through the twin notions of kenosis and plerosis he threads his way through the labyrinth. Of special interest is his handling of Christ's manhood with relation to the possibility of sinning. In answer to the question—which is the true formula : *potuit non peccare* or *non potuit peccare*?—he affirms the second rather than the first. At first sight this may appear to threaten the reality of Christ's manhood. Forsyth argues that what is possible is the reality of temptation and testing, but not that of sin ! He knows how great a strain he is placing upon thought at this point in making his assertion. Yet he is only following the path made by the theologians of Chalcedon : “ because Christ was true man He could be truly tempted ; because He was true God He could not truly sin ; but He was not less true man for that ” (p. 302).

The most original chapter in the book is that on the *Self-fulfilment of Christ*. Wherein lies the importance of this creative chapter ? In a theologian, to whom the reality of Christ's Godhead is essential to Christianity, seizing hold of the idea of an “ acquired divinity ” and using it to great effect to express a true and complete doctrine of Christ's Person. Hitherto the idea had been opposed to the essential divinity of Christ. This feature occurs time and again in Forsyth. He is able to see the truth at the root of every theological error and

transmute it to the service of the Gospel. Hence "Christ came to be what He always vitally was, by what I have called a process of moral redintegration. He moved by His history *to* a supernal world that He moved in by His nature" (p. 338). The student of early church history knows what a price the ancients paid for their true and noble insistence upon the reality of the Lord's deity. They were not sufficiently interested in the human life of Jesus. Hence the dreary controversies which arose to rend the unity of the body of Christ . . . two natures, two energies, two wills, etc. With all his fierce opposition to Liberalism with its caricature in the "historical Jesus", Forsyth never lost his grip on the humanity of Jesus. We may take leave to criticize Dr. W. L. Bradley at this point. There are times when Forsyth appears to have a docetic Christ in his ringing the changes as he works out a doctrine far removed in language from the tone of the Synoptic Gospels, yet he is always within reach of his foundation in the life and ministry of Jesus Himself. Dr. J. K. Mozley has pinpointed the issue in quoting from *Religion and Recent Art*. Forsyth is discussing Holman Hunt's picture, "The Shadow of Death," and he affirms: "We never can have a Christ in Art whose divinity is as unmistakeable as His humanity. We have neglected and falsified the humanity in the effort to render such a Christ. Our artistic effort must now, perhaps, be rather to represent the divine Man than the human God. If Art will help us to realize the Man, if imagination will bring near to us, and endear to us, and ennoble for us, the passion and presence of His human life, there are other resources which will keep us in the truth as to His godhead" (p. 195). What he declared in his earlier work on art, he affirmed in his later work on theology.

Certain features are absent from his treatment of the subject. There is no speculative metaphysic nor philosophical theology in it. He distrusted those tendencies in theology which were uppermost in his day. Neither was he concerned with credal definitions and conciliar statements. They were lifeless and belonged to the sphere of text-books rather than to the experience of the living Church. Religion must not degenerate into mystic theosophy but remain ethically dogmatic and dynamically ethical. The Incarnation was to be interpreted by way of the atonement. "There is the incarnation which puts us at once at the moral heart of reality—the Son made sin rather than the Word made flesh. The incarnation has no religious value but as the background of the atonement" (*Positive Preaching and the Modern Mind*, p. 182).

* * * *

Without doubt Forsyth's largest work was *The Principle of Authority*. This major theme had held his attention throughout his life and reappears in all his writings in one way or another. Thus in delivering the Yale Lectures on preaching in 1907 he declares: "The Gospel for the sensitive (the keynote of the modern ethic) lacks the note of authority which is the modern world's chief need, and which is heard in its power, not in the heart, but in the conscience. Authority's seat and source is not God's love, but God's holiness" (p. 332). This problem is still with us and no nearer of solution. What is the Gospel,

and what is the source of our certainty concerning it? On the one hand is it the "Catholic" insistence on the Church, and on the other hand is it the Protestant insistence on the infallibility of the Bible? Forsyth went behind both Bible and Church to that which is the creator of both—the Gospel of God's redeeming and recreative act in Christ. "Remember that Christ did not come to bring a Bible but to bring a Gospel. The Bible arose afterward from the Gospel to serve the Gospel. The Bible, the preacher, and the Church, are all made by the same thing—the Gospel" (*Positive Preaching and the Modern Mind*, p. 15).

In this day of ecumenism the nature of apostolic authority is important since it gives rise to controversies over the character of the Church as an institution, and the quality of the ministries of the divided church. Forsyth's contribution to this pressing issue appears to have been overlooked. The fifth and sixth lectures of *The Person and Place of Jesus Christ* still offer valid insights into the subject which are needed to-day. Have we in the Apostles a true and inspired interpretation of Christ? With startling and trenchant words he says that "most of the higher pains and troubles of the Church to-day arise from the displacement of its centre of gravity to the Gospels. The Epistles are more inspired than the Gospels. We are in more direct contact with Christ. We are at one remove only. We hear the man who had Christ's own interpretation of His work." If the apostles were wrong in their conception of Christ's saving work, how was it that Jesus did not save them from this initial and fatal error? "Apostolic inspiration, therefore, is a certain action stirred by the heavenly Christ in the soul, by which His first elect were enabled to see the moral, spiritual, and theological nature of the manifestation with a unique clearness, a clearness and explicitness perhaps not always present to Christ's own mind in doing the act" (*The Person and Place of Jesus Christ*, p. 176). This does not mean that the apostles were infallible as men, in the same way that the Pope of Rome claims to be infallible when speaking *ex cathedra*, but right in their proclamation of the central verities of the faith, and human in those things that lie further from the centre. What they offered to the world was a Gospel, a *kerygma*.

This means that authority can never be confined to men or books. It can be mediated through them. The final authority is that of God Himself, exercised in a personal manner upon individuals through delegated channels. This authority begins in the new creation when the soul is brought into touch with the living God through the activity of the Holy Ghost. In this moment of revelation by Christ His Lordship is established and maintained through the fellowship of the Church, the instruction of the Word, read and heard, and the inner testimony of the Holy Spirit. Society at large will only be renovated as this dynamic force converts its members to the sovereignty of the Most High. Political programmes are limited in their success, and society likely to perish because of the radical nature of human sin, until God has established His reign in the individual and in society. This is the burden of Forsyth's major work. It is no narrow gospel, but comprehensive and penetrating, and the outworking of the idea

of authority into every sphere of life. Christ's Gospel answers the situation created by man's sin and reaches out to the whole of humanity. "Humanity is not a mere mass of units. It is an organism with a history." God's treatment of it is redemptive, grounded in history. "The content of this redemption is the living, loving, saving God; its compass is cosmic, its sphere is human history, actual history."

This leads us on naturally to Forsyth's theory of knowledge. He has really provided us with a philosophy of religion and an idea of God. He takes sides with those who lay the emphasis upon the *will*. He is a voluntarist and not an intellectualist. Kant has influenced him at this point. Hence his stress upon ethical religion and moral doctrine. "The last reality, and that with which every man willy-nilly has to do, is not a reality of thought, but of life, and of conscience, and of judgment. We are in the world to act and take the consequences. Action means and matters everything in the world" (*The Cruciality of the Cross*, p. 121). Twentieth century thinkers and theologians are too concerned with ideas. Admittedly "ideas have legs", but so often they are confined to the mind rather than the morals. They are no more than mere subjectivism. What is Christian experience? It is essentially certainty. This is not a product of our own thinking, but of that which is given to us by God in the experience of coming to know Him as the living and true God. This certainty can only exist where there is revelation by God Himself to the believing soul. Faith is "an organ of real knowledge". Yet this faith is the creation and gift of God. As Irenaeus put it: "It is impossible to know God except through God." Forsyth, with his usual epigrammatic form of statement says: "Our knowledge relates not to an object but to a subject who takes the initiative, not to what we reach but to what reaches us, not to something we know but to someone who knows us. It is knowledge not of a known thing but of a knowable God" (*The Principle of Authority*, p. 102). This relationship is established in the conscience and in the will. In that region we are saved and recreated by God's own power. In this moral universe man at last confronts His Maker and Judge and finds salvation in Christ, "commensurate with the sanctity, the majesty, the rock reality of things".

* * * *

Within the space limited to our study it is now necessary to assess the abiding worth of Forsyth's contribution to the current theological debate. This has been done well by Dr. William Lee Bradley in his thesis, *P. T. Forsyth, the Man and His Work* (Independent Press, 1952). He asks the question: is he a man of extraordinary insight or merely a crank? Forsyth appeared to lose the fight in the controversy with the Rev. R. J. Campbell in 1907 over "The New Theology". His writings have been criticized by friend and foe alike because of their bizarre titles and scintillating, but sometimes confusing, wealth of presentation. Dr. James Denney, in a letter to Dr. W. Robertson Nicoll writes: "I enclose a short notice of Forsyth's book, *Missions in State and Church*, which I have found very difficult to read. If this is how one feels who is heartily at one with the writer, how must

it strike the unsympathetic reader? He has more true and important things to say, in my opinion, than anyone at present writing on theology." Writing to the same person about *Christ on Parnassus: Lectures on Art, Ethic, and Theology*, Denney concludes: "I like Forsyth's book very much. It is wonderfully free from his usual peculiarities . . . and really full of ideas and interest." To his sister he writes about a visit to Hackney College to deliver a lecture, and describes his host as "an extremely clever though rather tantalizing man". These insights into his character were never intended for publication, and are the more valuable in showing us what his contemporaries felt about his contributions to the thought of his day.

Dr. A. S. Peake, in the obituary notice in the *Holborn Review*, touches another aspect in answer to the problem postulated for us by Dr. Bradley: "He challenged with ringing, piercing note the tendency of our time to dilute or explain away the vital essence of salvation. For him the death of Christ was not a reassuring message from God that we needed only to repent and His free forgiveness would be bestowed. It was rather the solution devised by God of a moral problem otherwise intractable, a solution which taxed His wisdom while it expressed His love. And behind the challenge thus offered there was the weight of a personality and an equipment which could not be ignored. He spoke as one gifted with prophetic vision and power of utterance who was also versed in the learning and wisdom of the schools. A more gracious and sympathetic approach might have opened some hearts to his message which were closed by resentment at his tone."

Dr. W. L. Bradley ends his summary with the conviction that "the present interest in Forsyth will decline, but it is unlikely that he will be forgotten as he was before. Theology has caught up with him now." I cannot share this view. Theology has not yet completely caught up with P. T. Forsyth. In its present preoccupation with the doctrine of the Church, ecumenism has only just commenced its task. The ultimate question concerning the *foundation* of the Church has yet to be asked. Hitherto the questions of order and government have reigned supreme. The time will come when men will ask deeper questions. What makes the Church the *Church*? Lying at the root of all these discussions is the fact of a valid atonement with perennial power to convert the unreached with the good news of salvation. No work of outstanding merit on the Atonement has been produced (with the exception of *The Death of Christ* by James Denney) in this century. Several attempts have been made to provide a synthesis of current views. Perhaps Forsyth will come into his own again in this sphere? Unfortunately his three books on this subject were only occasional productions and lack that systematic treatment which would have made them enduring. Yet even here Forsyth would affirm that religious works should never be systematic since that feature belongs to philosophy proper. To reduce religion to a system is to destroy it. The only value of one great book on the subject would have been the clearing up of his meaning in places where it is doubtful. As Dr. Peake put it, "this amazing gift of expression was combined with a real defect in the gift of conveying his precise meaning, even to sympa-

thetic and intelligent readers". Because of this characteristic his contributions have been described as "fireworks in a fog". Peake alters the metaphor: "Many a reader has been left dazed by a series of electric flashes which did not succeed in dispelling the obscurity that gathered around the subject." A generation reared on Barth and Bultmann does not feel the same difficulty, or perhaps they rely more on the reviewers to present them with a "digest" which suffices. Forsyth's value to younger men lies in his ability still to enable them to preach a redemptive Gospel with intellectual conviction. His books may tax the reader, and he may see distinctions and differences where the plain man does not, nevertheless the cumulative effect of his books is tremendous. He is at one with critical scholarship, yet no modernist. While others are bewildered by the processes, he is reaching out for the chief gains. With all the passion of his soul he presents Jesus Christ, as Son of God and Saviour. Mind and heart go into the preaching of the Gospel. An index to his real worth is given by Canon J. K. Mozley in his invaluable text-book on the doctrine of the atonement. More space is given to Forsyth than to any other of the moderns. Forsyth is concerned to defend and to interpret in modern categories the central verities of the Gospel of the grace of God. The finest critique of Forsyth's theology is that provided by Dr. Mozley in his book *The Heart of the Gospel* (S.P.C.K., 1925). Indeed, the book is dedicated to him in grateful and affectionate remembrance.

The greatness of Forsyth lies in his feeling the pulse of Christianity and recognizing its weaknesses. He begins his *magnum opus* with these words: "The conviction in these pages is that the principle of authority is ultimately the whole religious question." He saw the critical importance of the theme in a day of revolt against it. So many of his colleagues had lost themselves in lesser issues. To this centre ecumenism must sooner or later return. "By what authority doest thou these things, and who gave thee this authority?" Forsyth is at pains to point out that authority expressed in terms of statutory law, institutional religion, or even religious experience, is not final but secondary, and derived from an ultimate source, which is found in God alone. These delegated authorities find their sanction in the measure that they convey God's sovereign rule. Our Holy Overlord uses these lesser ordinances of Bible, Church, and experience to express His own dominion over the soul. In this humble submission is found "perfect freedom". In Forsyth's day this vast subject was neglected. Yet, as Dr. John Oman has shown, "the ultimate problem of the last two centuries has been the relation of faith and freedom". Forsyth's answer is given in terms of the Cross. "That is where our real faith is fixed—on the finished redeeming work of the Saviour on the Cross, sealed indeed in the resurrection but finished on the Cross, published in the resurrection but achieved on the Cross" (*Positive Preaching and the Modern Mind*, p. 270).

The Place and Purpose of the Sacraments

(continued from the last issue)

BY THE EDITOR

THE baptismal situation in the Church of England to-day is so unsatisfactory that the urgent need for an effective form of sacramental discipline can hardly be questioned. Sacramental discipline which is founded upon the great doctrinal principles of Holy Scripture must be imposed if people in general are to realize that the sacraments of the Church do after all *mean* something. The indiscriminate administration of baptism to the children of parents who ordinarily have no connection with the life of the Church, and for many of whom having their children "done" is little more than a mark of social respectability, or an atavistic superstition, constitutes a grave scandal within the Church of Christ. It is a hard statistical fact that the majority of children brought to the baptismal font grow up like heathen in separation from the fellowship and instruction of the Church. This makes their baptism a shameful mockery.

What should be done to remedy this scandalous situation? In the first place it must be determined which children are eligible for baptism, or rather which parents are eligible to have their children baptized. Parents whose children are candidates for baptism should themselves be active members and worshippers of the Church. There can be no possible justification for according the seal of God's covenant of grace to children who, because of parental unconcern, will grow up in ignorance of the promises and responsibilities of that covenant.

Secondly, the Church must realize that the primary challenge of this situation is that of evangelization, and, indeed, that it is to a large degree a *missionary* situation with which she is confronted in England, which means that in meeting the urgent evangelistic challenge she must think more concretely in terms of greater numbers of *adult* baptisms—baptisms, that is, of those who, having grown up as pagans outside her influence, have been brought to conversion through the message of the Gospel. And if they are parents, their children should be baptized with them. It is converted, believing, committed parents who, in co-operation with the Church, are fitted to give effect to the requirement of the baptismal service that their children should be "virtuously brought up to lead a godly and a Christian life". And it is the children of such parents who are the proper recipients of the sacrament of baptism.

Thirdly, baptism should normally always be administered *publicly*. That this is the intended practice of the Church of England is shown both by the title of the service—"The Public Baptism of Infants"—and by the rubrical instruction prefixed to the service requiring that its ministration should take place "when the most number of people come together". And yet it is the common practice to-day to administer baptism when the least number of people come together, that

is, in the presence of the parents, godparents, and a few friends, and in the absence of the regular worshipping congregation. The sacraments, however, are not individual acts. They are corporate, collective acts of believers, that is, of Christ's body, the Church. Individual administration of the Lord's Supper, or celebration at which the congregation does not participate, destroys the nature of Holy Communion. Individualism has done great harm to the sacrament of baptism; for baptism, properly understood, is public confession, in the congregation, of the Gospel word of regeneration. It is not merely an individual occasion, limited to the one to be baptized, nor a domestic occasion, limited to the family and friends of the one to be baptized, but an ecclesiastical occasion which is the concern of the whole Church. This being so, it is most undesirable that baptism should be administered in isolation from the worshipping congregation. It should be public, in the church. It should, in short, ordinarily be administered in the course of Morning (or Evening) Prayer.

Baptism of this truly public nature would in itself have a strong disciplinary effect, in that many who are strangers to the worshipping and witnessing fellowship of the Church, while blandly submitting to a semi-private family ceremony, would find themselves unwilling to face the solemn implications of presenting their children for baptism in the presence of the whole congregation.

A further reason why the service should be public is that every baptism should have significance for *all* those who witness it: it should remind them of their own baptism and of everything which it signified; it should cause them to examine themselves whether they be in the faith (II Cor. xiii. 5). Accordingly, one of the purposes assigned in the Prayer Book rubric for baptism in public is "that in the baptism of infants every man present may be put in remembrance of his own profession made to God in his baptism".

One further matter which may briefly be mentioned here in connection with the question of baptismal discipline is that of the function of godparents or sponsors. In the medieval period the radical incompatibility between nature and grace propounded by the Church (resulting from the assimilation into her system of certain non-biblical, philosophical elements) led to the view that a child's parents, being his parents in the order of *nature*, were thereby disqualified from acting for him in the realm of grace. The latter was declared to be the province of the Church, which was regarded as the sphere of grace as distinct from nature, and spiritual responsibility was entrusted to *god*-parents who (though this had not been the case in the early Church) came in this sense to be set in a position of antithesis to the natural parents. Indeed, fathers were expressly excluded from the baptism of their children! Scripture, however, knows no such divorce between nature and grace, and in fact speaks with great emphasis of the spiritual responsibilities involved in parenthood. The value of godparents is open to question, but if they are to be retained, then the door should be closed upon the medieval doctrine to which I have referred by making it compulsory (not merely permissible) for at least one parent, preferably the father, to act as sponsor (that is, one who accepts responsibility for the spiritual upbringing of the child) at a child's

baptism. At the same time at least one sponsor should belong to the regular worshipping congregation of the parish in which the child is baptized. Such measures would at least help to create a situation in which the Christian upbringing of the child in both home and Church may be fruitfully co-ordinated. There will be some reasonable certainty that he will grow up within the covenant sphere of the Christian community in its twofold but integral aspect of home and Church.

Baptism, then, is not a mere addition to the church cradle roll ; nor is it simply the dedication or offering by parents of their child to God. It is the acknowledgment of the divine initiative and goodness, of the priority of God's grace. It is, in fact, *God* claiming what is His own, declaring that the child's true destiny is one of salvation, that he is born to be born again, that he is by right a citizen of the kingdom of heaven, that he is to grow up and be educated in the redeemed society, that he is a beneficiary of the covenant of grace and heir to its promises. If, as he grows up, his baptism makes no impression upon him, if he remains unaware of its significance, the fault must lie with both Church and parents, whose duty it is to instruct him concerning his spiritual heritage and to expound to him with care and perseverance the meaning of God's covenant in Christ Jesus. If Church and parents faithfully discharge this duty, then in due course it becomes the responsibility of the child who has been baptized to confirm his baptism and to declare his allegiance to the terms of the covenant. At the same time he is faced with the awful possibility of repudiating his spiritual birthright.

* * * *

The significance of the sacrament of Holy Communion may be summarized under four heads. Firstly, it is a symbol of spiritual nutrition. As bread and wine nourish the body, so they are fit symbols to speak, as by a visible word, of the nourishment which Christ provides for the soul. The external elements of bread and wine point us to our Lord's promise: " He that eateth My flesh and drinketh My blood hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day " (John vi. 54), and remind us of the inward truth that *to come to Him* is to eat His flesh and *to believe on Him* is to drink His blood, in accordance with His words uttered on the same occasion: " He that cometh to Me shall never hunger, and he that believeth on Me shall never thirst " (John vi. 35). Christ, therefore, as the second exhortation of the Communion Service declares, is offered to us as " our spiritual food and sustenance in that holy sacrament ",⁴⁶ and those who receive the sacrament hear the invitation: " Feed on Him in thy heart by faith with thanksgiving ", which reminds them that the true feeding on Christ is not physical or carnal, but spiritual, in the believing heart which closes with and appropriates as its own the Gospel promises of which the visible elements are signs and pledges.

Thus the third exhortation of the Communion Service affirms that, " if with a true penitent heart and lively faith we receive that holy sacrament, . . . then we spiritually eat the flesh of Christ, and drink His blood ; then we dwell in Christ, and Christ in us ; we are one with

Christ, and Christ with us ". Becon defines the Lord's supper as " an holy and heavenly banquet, in the which the faithful Christians, besides the corporal eating of the bread and outward drinking of the wine, do spiritually through faith both eat the body of Christ and drink His blood, unto the confirmation of their faith, the comfort of their conscience, and the salvation of their souls ", and as " a spiritual food, in the which Christ Jesus the Son of God witnesseth that He is the living bread, wherewith our souls are fed unto everlasting life ".⁴⁶ It was, indeed, customary for the Reformers to speak picturesquely of faith as the mouth of the soul. " This spiritual meat of Christ's body and blood is not received in the mouth and digested in the stomach (as corporal meats and drinks commonly be)," asserts Archbishop Cranmer, " but it is received with a pure heart and a sincere faith. And the true eating and drinking of the said body and blood of Christ is, with a constant and lively faith to believe that Christ gave His body upon the cross for us, and that He doth so join and incorporate Himself to us, that He is our Head, and we His members, and flesh of His flesh, and bone of His bones, having Him dwelling in us, and we in Him. And herein standeth the whole effect and strength of this sacrament. And this faith God worketh inwardly in our hearts by His Holy Spirit, and confirmeth the same outwardly to our ears by hearing of His word, and to our other senses by eating and drinking of the sacramental bread and wine in His holy supper."⁴⁷

Secondly, this sacrament is intended as a symbol of unity. It is an expression of Christian oneness, or communion, symbolized by the one loaf and the one cup of which all who are present partake. " The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a communion of the blood of Christ ? " asks the Apostle. " The bread which we break, is it not a communion of the body of Christ ? seeing that we, who are many, are one bread, one body : for we all partake of the one loaf " (I Cor. x. 16f.). One purpose of the institution of this holy banquet was, says Becon, " that it should be a sign and a token of the unity and concord, of the hearty good will and singular friendship, and of the perfect agreement in doctrine and religion that ought to be among them that profess Christ ".⁴⁸ It is at the Lord's table, more than anywhere else, that Christ's followers should by their common participation in this sacrament testify to the world of their indissoluble oneness, through grace and faith, and in love and destiny, with Christ and therefore with each other. Yet to-day we are confronted with the shocking scandal that in the Christian Church the table of the Lord has become a place of division and disharmony instead of fellowship and unity. It has been degraded into a denominational board from which, all too frequently, those of other ecclesiastical connections, however genuine their devotion to the common Lord, are excluded.

Much of the current fashionable talk about reunion has an ironically hollow ring about it when it is found that its advocates are unable, because of theories of sacramental exclusivism, to come together for brotherly participation in this sacrament of unity. In the light of scriptural realism a far more urgent and practical step than that of organization for reunion would be the removal without compunction by the various denominations of the barriers which at present prevent

fellow-Christians from expressing before the world their true oneness with each other in Christ. If this were done—and it should be done for the honour of our one Redeemer—we should cease to speak of different denominations as different “communions”, and we should at last be able to display to the world a measure of that true communion in Christ by obediently uniting round *His* table, however much diversities of denominational emphasis might remain—and remain they will, human personality being as diverse as it is. Such an expression of real communion in freedom, without insisting on uniformity, could not fail to produce a powerful effect on the watching world.

Thirdly, the significance of the sacrament of Holy Communion is commemorative. In accordance with our Lord’s command, “Do this in remembrance of Me,” it is commemorative of Christ Himself, our only Saviour and Redeemer, by whose death we have been reconciled to God. This sacrament was ordained by Him (as the third exhortation of the Communion Service explains) “to the end that we should always remember the exceeding great love of our Master and only Saviour, Jesus Christ, thus dying for us, and the innumerable benefits which by His precious blood-shedding He hath obtained to us”. It is a proclaiming of His death (I Cor. xi. 26), of His body broken and His blood shed for us on the cross, as symbolized by the bread broken and the wine outpoured.

And, fourthly, it is anticipatory. Not only is it retrospective but also prospective, looking forward to Christ’s return in glory as well as backward to His atoning death. “*Hoc mysterium duo tempora extrema conjungit*,” says Bengel in a fine epigram. It forms as it were a bridge linking our Lord’s personal departure from this earthly scene to His personal return at the end of the age. “As often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup,” St. Paul instructs the Corinthians, “ye proclaim the Lord’s death *till He come*” (I Cor. xi. 26). Christ instituted this sacrament, as the prayer of consecration reminds us, “a perpetual memory of that His precious death, *until His coming again*”. And when He comes again to receive those who are His to Himself (John xiv. 3) there will be no further place for a sacrament celebrated in remembrance of Him. Then indeed (in the words of Bishop Christopher Wordsworth’s hymn) “faith will vanish into sight, hope be emptied in delight”. In view of this truth, Holy Communion may be described as the sacrament of Christ’s bodily absence.

* * * *

It would be incongruous for us to do something in remembrance of a person who was bodily present with us! To speak of the Holy Communion as the sacrament of Christ’s bodily absence, however, is not to imply that Christ is absent from the sacrament. On the contrary, together with the fathers of the ancient Church and the divines of the Church of England, it is our conviction that Christ is really present at the sacrament which He instituted, but that this real presence of His is a *spiritual* presence, within every grateful and believing heart, not carnal or external or localized upon an “altar”, and the presence of Christ realized by all who worthily receive the

sacrament is not different in kind from that experienced by every regenerate heart at all times, in accordance with His parting promise before being visibly separated from His disciples: "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world" (Matt. xxviii. 20). "Christ is really," declares Cranmer, "not only in them that duly receive the sacrament of the Lord's supper, but also in them that duly receive the sacrament of baptism, and in all other true Christian people at other times when they receive no sacrament; for all they be members of Christ's body, and temples in whom He truly inhabiteth."⁴⁹ Again, he complains to his adversary Gardiner: "You gather of my sayings unjustly that Christ is indeed absent; for I say (according to God's word and the doctrine of the old writers) that Christ is present in His sacraments, as they teach also that He is present in His word, when He worketh mightily by the same in the hearts of the hearers."⁵⁰ The sacrament of Holy Communion is the divine seal affixed to and confirming the apostolic word: "Christ in you, the hope of glory" (Col. i. 27), giving assurance, during this period of His bodily absence, of His inward, spiritual, holy presence to all who feed on Him in their hearts by faith.

It was, of course, necessary for Cranmer and his fellow-Reformers to explain that they used the term "really" (*realiter*) in a sense different from that intended by their papal opponents, who followed the understanding of medieval philosophy in giving it a physical and concrete significance. Men, indeed, are constantly prone to assign greater reality to that which is visibly and tangibly perceptible. Such a misconception would be avoided if only one of the basic truths of Scripture and experience were more consistently remembered, namely, that the greatest and indeed ultimate reality is the spiritual, the inward, and not that which is externally local and sensible. The presence of the ascended Christ with His people is no longer that of one who is alongside of them, in company with them, and yet separate as an object over against them. By the mystery of the new birth their relationship to Him is that of union and identification. Thus the ascended Christ was more *really* known by the Apostles, who by the inner operation of the Pentecostal gift of the Holy Spirit experienced the reality of "ye *in* Me, and I *in* you" (John xiv. 20; cf. xvii. 21ff.), than He had been known by them during His earthly ministry, when they had only been *with* Him, alongside of Him, the companions and witnesses of His physical and visible presence. This knowledge of Christ *after the flesh* was to be superseded and transcended by a knowledge incomparably more precious and intimate (II Cor. v. 16). Hence our Lord's question to one of the Twelve at the conclusion of His earthly ministry: "Have I been so long time with you, and dost thou not know Me, Philip?" (John xiv. 9). But now, since Pentecost, to have the Holy Spirit is to know Christ in the deepest and innermost sense possible until the day of His return when, seeing Him even as He is, we shall be like Him (I John iii. 2), fully conformed at last to the image of His glory (II Cor. iii. 18; Rom. viii. 29).

"He is there, indeed, sitting at the right hand of the Father," says Augustine, "and He is here also, for He has not withdrawn the presence of His majesty. In other words, in respect of the presence of His

majesty we always have Christ ; in respect of the presence of His flesh it was rightly said to His disciples, ' Me ye will not have always.' For in respect of the presence of His flesh the Church possessed Him for a few days only : now it possesses Him by faith, without seeing Him with the eyes."⁵¹ " Breath should fail me," says Becon, " if I should go forth to recite the sayings of all the ancient Greek and Latin writers which most constantly affirm that as the Lord Christ, in that He is God, is everywhere and filleth all places at all times, so likewise, in that He is man, He is only in heaven, and in no place else, where He shall remain until the day of judgment, according to the Scriptures."⁵² " There is no such thing in deed and in truth as they call transubstantiation," says Bishop Ridley, " for the substance of bread remaineth still in the sacrament of the body. Then also the natural substance of Christ's human nature, which He took of the Virgin Mary, is in heaven, where it reigneth now in glory, and not here inclosed under the form of bread."⁵³ " The body then which we eat is in heaven," says Jewel, " above all angels and archangels and powers and principalities. Our meat is in heaven on high ; and we are here below on earth. How may it be said that we may reach it, or taste it, or eat it ? . . . By the hand of faith we reach unto Him, and by the mouth of faith we receive His body."⁵⁴ Participation in the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ should assure us not just that Christ is present with us at that time and in that place, but that it is God's purpose, as the Prayer of Humble Access in the Communion Service declares, " that we may evermore dwell in Him, and He in us ".

In his sermon preached in the University Church at Oxford on Whit Monday, 1955, in commemoration of the Reformation martyrs who had been burnt at the stake in that city four hundred years previously, the Bishop of Rochester, Dr. Christopher Chavasse, reminded his numerous and distinguished audience that it was our Reformers who had recovered for us the eucharistic doctrine of the early Church, and that transubstantiation (which they unequivocally repudiated as contrary to Scripture and subversive of the unique and never-to-be-repeated reconciling work of Christ on the cross) " was, literally, the ' burning ' question of the Marian reaction, as the examinations of all its martyrs reveal ". In this connection he quotes Archbishop Laud's pointed comment: " Transubstantiation is either a fundamental point, or it is not. If it is not fundamental, why did the Papist put the Protestant to death for it? And why did the Protestant suffer death? " " Eucharistic doctrine," continues Dr. Chavasse, " is, indeed, fundamental both to faith and worship. It is the touchstone whether God is worshipped in spirit and in truth, or whether a church is falling away into superstition and error. To worship the Blessed Sacrament as ' He ', instead of reverencing ' It ', to teach that the consecrated bread and wine *contain* a localized Christ, instead of *conveying* to the worthy receiver a Presence that is already ' in the midst ' ; this, on Ridley's showing, is ' false doctrine ' and an ' idolatrous use '. History, too, exposes such a conception as one that inevitably exchanges the Living Christ for a mediatory Church and a priesthood that creates the ' Victim of the Altar '."⁵⁵

These errors, rejected by our Reformers, were brought back into the Church of England by the leaders of the Oxford Movement last century. While it is true that the theology of contemporary Anglo-Catholicism disowns theories of transubstantiation, yet it can hardly be by accident that the normal and necessary accompaniments of this doctrine have been embraced, such as the concept of a sacerdotal ministry whose highest function is concerned with the sacrifice of the altar, the mass vestments, eastward position, fasting communion, and the reservation and adoration of the consecrated wafer. The Anglo-Catholic mind has, indeed, shown itself fertile in producing a considerable variety of hypotheses concerning the precise nature of the presence of Christ in the Eucharist; and the views propounded have this in common, that they all postulate an analogy between Christ's presence in the sacrament and His incarnation.

The following is an explanation of the method or "mechanics" of the localization of Christ's presence on the eucharistic altar which has been offered by Dr. E. L. Mascall, one of the best known Anglo-Catholic thinkers of our day: "Just as, in the case of the Incarnation, it is right to say that Christ 'came down from heaven' to Bethlehem, so long as we remember that this took place 'not by conversion of Godhead into flesh but by taking up of manhood into God', so, in the case of the Eucharist, it is right to say that Christ 'comes down from heaven' on to our altars, so long as we remember that the manner of this descent is not a conversion of Christ into bread but a taking up of bread into Christ."⁵⁶ At the Eucharist, in other words, there is an assumption of "breadness" by Christ—an echo, this, of certain pre-Reformation speculations—though Dr. Mascall disavows that the eucharistic change supposedly effected is the same thing as a hypostatic union. In this aspect, then, it is not similar to the incarnation. Historic Anglicanism, however, does not speak of the descent and localization of Christ at the sacrament, but keeps closer to scriptural thought in regarding the Holy Communion as a means of grace whereby rather we may be uplifted in spirit to heavenly places in Christ Jesus. This idea is admirably expressed both in the *Sursum corda* of the Communion Service ("Lift up your hearts!") Answer: "We lift them up unto the Lord"), which immediately follows the "comfortable words" of the Gospel, and in the collect of Ascension Day: "Grant, we beseech Thee, Almighty God, that like as we do believe Thy only begotten Son our Lord Jesus Christ to have ascended into the heavens, so we may also in heart and mind thither ascend, and with Him continually dwell" (cf. Eph. ii. 6; Col. iii. 1).

Dr. Mascall seeks to sustain his hypothesis of the presence of Christ on the eucharistic altar by speaking of the incarnate body of Christ as existing under three different modes, in the following manner: "As a natural Body it was seen on earth, hung on the Cross, rose in glory on the first Easter Day, and was taken into heaven in the Ascension; as a mystical Body it appeared on earth on the first Whitsunday and we know it as the Holy Catholic Church; as a sacramental body it becomes present on our altars at every Eucharist when, by the operation of the Holy Ghost and the priestly act of Christ, bread and wine are transformed into, and made one with, the glorified Body which is

in heaven.”⁵⁷ It is not our intention to enter here into a detailed discussion of the implications of this threefold concept. We shall offer only a few observations which are relevant to the subject under consideration in this article. In the first place, we are confronted with the extraordinary incongruity of Christ’s *glorified* body being conceived as present on an *altar*, or on many altars, whereas the New Testament teaches with the utmost clarity that it was in His body of *humiliation* that Christ offered Himself, once-for-all, on the cross for us sinners. In His glorified body Christ is seated at the right hand of the Majesty on High. To locate Him, under whatever mode, on an earthly altar, and to degrade His incarnation to a state of “impanation”, is to place Christ in a situation that is far removed from the exalted glory which, according to the New Testament, He now enjoys.

It will be observed, also, that this is a hypothesis which seeks to justify an identification of the outward and visible sign with the inward and visible grace which it symbolizes. We are asked to believe that the elements of bread and wine are “transformed into, and made one with, the glorified Body which is in heaven”, or, as Dr. Mascall says in a later passage, “taken up into the supernatural order and identified with the holy things which they contain”.⁵⁸ This concept is in harmony with the progressive organic evolutionism as propounded in modern Anglo-Catholic theology, which postulates that each new organic level in the evolutionary process includes and elevates within itself every lower and anterior level, and which regards the incarnation as the predestined consummation of the whole order of creation whereby the carnal is raised into the spiritual, the human into the divine.

* * * *

But to identify the outward and visible sign with the inward and spiritual grace which it symbolizes is to overthrow the nature of a sacrament, as it has been understood both in historic Anglicanism and in the ancient Church. Thus Augustine affirms that “those things are sacraments in which not what they are but what they display is always considered, since they are signs of things, being one thing in themselves, and yet signifying another thing”;⁵⁹ and Hooker says that the sacraments “are not really nor do really contain in themselves that grace which with them or by them it pleaseth God to bestow”.⁶⁰ The identification of the sacramental elements with the holy things which they signify leads inevitably to the reservation and adoration of the sacrament and to other associated practices of a like unscriptural, unprimitive, superstitious, and idolatrous character. This teaching of transformation and identification, moreover, carries with it the strange and disabling anomaly that, of every supposedly priestly act of consecration and transformation of the elements, that alone of Christ Himself, the divine Author of the sacrament, was void of effect; for when He said of the bread, “This is My body,” and of the wine, “This is My blood,” by no stretch of the imagination could His Apostles have understood these words in a literalistic sense, nor could they have interpreted them in a modalistic manner like that proposed by Dr. Mascall, as though Christ had meant, “I am locally present in these elements, though under a sacramental mode,” for the

evident reason that at that very time when He was instituting this sacrament and uttering these sentences His humanity, flesh and blood intact, was locally and visibly present before them. The Apostles, in a word, could only have understood what He said in a symbolical manner.

A return to the pristine simplicity of the Lord's supper as described in the pages of the New Testament should be sufficient to show that the attempts of neo-scholastic speculation to devise an ontological metaphysic which will justify its doctrine of Christ's sacramental presence are remote from scriptural reality and overthrow the nature and purpose of scriptural symbolism. Hooker's answer to the question *where* Christ's presence is, is the answer of the whole Reformed Church, namely, that "the real presence of Christ's most blessed body and blood is not . . . to be sought for in the sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the sacrament. . . . I see not," he continues, "which way it should be gathered by the words of Christ, when and where the bread is His body or the cup His blood, but only in the very heart and soul of him which receiveth them." And he goes on to make an astute comment on the inconsistency of those who identify the sacrament with the reality of which it is the sign in the case of Holy Communion, but forbear to do so in the case of baptism: "If on all sides it be confessed that the grace of baptism is poured into the soul of man, that by water we receive it, although it be neither seated in the water nor the water changed into it, what should induce men to think that the grace of the eucharist must needs be in the eucharist before it can be in us that receive it?"⁶¹ So also Ridley had maintained the same doctrine at his last examination, prior to his martyrdom, in Oxford: "The true substance and nature of bread and wine remaineth," he declared, "with which the body is in like sort nourished, as the soul is by grace and Spirit with the body of Christ. Even so in baptism the body is washed with the visible water, and the soul is cleansed from all filth by the invisible Holy Ghost; and yet the water ceaseth not to be water, but keepeth the nature of water still: in like sort, in the sacrament of the Lord's supper the bread ceaseth not to be bread."⁶² And Jewel writes: "One thing is seen, and another understood. We see the water, but we understand the blood of Christ. Even so we see the bread and wine, but with the eyes of our understanding we look beyond these creatures; we reach our spiritual senses into heaven, and behold the ransom and price of our salvation. We do behold in the sacrament, not what it is, but what it doth signify."⁶³

In conclusion, let us hear the affirmations of two former archbishops of the Church of England. Firstly, Thomas Cranmer: "My doctrine is, that the very body of Christ, which was born of the virgin Mary, and suffered for our sins, giving us life by His death, the same Jesus, as concerning His corporal presence, is taken from us, and sitteth at the right hand of His Father; and yet He is by faith spiritually present with us, and is our spiritual food and nourishment, and sitteth in the midst of all them that be gathered together in His name. And this feeding is a spiritual feeding, and an heavenly feeding, far passing all corporal and carnal feeding; and therefore there is a true presence and a true feeding in deed, and not in a figure only. . . . This is the

true understanding of the true presence, receiving, and feeding upon the body and blood of our Saviour Christ."⁶⁴

Secondly, Edwin Sandys: "In this sacrament there are two things, a visible sign, and an invisible grace : there is a visible sacramental sign of bread and wine, and there is the thing and matter signified, namely, the body and blood of Christ : there is an earthly matter, and an heavenly matter. The outward sacramental sign is common to all, as well the bad as the good. Judas received the Lord's bread, but not that bread which is the Lord to the faithful receiver. The spiritual part, that which feedeth the soul, only the faithful do receive. For he cannot be partaker of the body of Christ, who is no member of Christ's body. . . . We must lift up ourselves from these external and earthly signs, and like eagles fly up and soar aloft, there to feed on Christ, who sitteth on the right hand of His Father, whom the heavens shall keep until the latter day. . . . Seeing then that Christ in His natural body is absent from hence ; seeing He is risen, and is not here ; seeing He hath left the world, and is gone to His Father ; ' how shall I ' , saith St. Augustine, ' lay hold on Him who is absent ? how shall I put my hand into heaven ? Send up thy faith, and thou hast taken hold ' ."⁶⁵

* * * * *

⁶⁵ Cf. also the post-communion prayer which speaks of " the spiritual food of the most precious Body and Blood of Thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ ".

⁶⁶ Becon ; *Op. cit.*, pp. 228f.

⁶⁷ Cranmer : *Op. cit.*, p. 43.

⁶⁸ Becon : *Op. cit.*, p. 231.

⁶⁹ Cranmer : *Op. cit.*, p. 140.

⁷⁰ Cranmer : *Op. cit.*, p. 11.

⁷¹ Augustine : *Tract*, L. 13, on the Gospel of John.

⁷² Becon : *Op. cit.*, p. 276.

⁷³ Nicholas Ridley, 1500-1555, Bishop of London and Reformation martyr : *A Brief Declaration of the Lord's Supper*, in *Works* (Parker Society), p. 12.

⁷⁴ Jewel : *Treatise of the Sacraments*, pp. 1118f. Cf. Cranmer : *Op. cit.*, p. 97, etc.

⁷⁵ C. M. Chavasse : *The Oxford Martyrs*, pp. 9f. (London, 1955).

⁷⁶ E. L. Mascall : *Op. cit.*, p. 198.

⁷⁷ Mascall : *Op. cit.*, pp. 161f.

⁷⁸ Mascall : *Op. cit.*, p. 197.

⁷⁹ Augustine : *Con. Maxim.*, ii, 22.

⁸⁰ Hooker : *Op. cit.*, V, lxxvii, 6.

⁸¹ Hooker : *Loc. cit.*

⁸² Ridley : *Ut supra*, p. 275.

⁸³ Jewel : *Treatise of the Sacraments*, p. 1117.

⁸⁴ Cranmer : *Op. cit.*, p. 185.

⁸⁵ Edwin Sandys, 1516-1588, Archbishop of York : *Sermons* (Parker Society), p. 88.

Book Reviews

Reviewers in this Issue

The Rev. M. Guthrie Clark, M.A.	The Rev. A. V. M'Callin, B.A., B.D.
The Rev. Professor G. C. B. Davies, M.A., D.D.	The Rev. Canon T. G. Mohan, M.A.
The Rev. D. K. Dean, M.A., B.D.	The Rev. L. E. H. Stephens-Hodge, M.A.
The Rev. Principal M. M. Hennell, M.A.	The Rev. R. F. Thomas, M.A.
The Rev. R. E. Higginson, M.A., B.D.	The Rev. D. H. Tongue, M.A.
The Rt. Rev. Frank Houghton, B.A.	The Rt. Rev. R. R. Williams, D.D., Bishop of Leicester
The Rev. Philip E. Hughes, M.A., B.D., D.Litt.	The Rev. Principal J. Stafford Wright, M.A.

ANGLICANISM.

By Stephen Neill. (Penguin Books.) 466 pp. 5s.

NOT ANGELS BUT ANGLICANS.

By D. L. Edwards. (S.C.M.) 128 pp. 8s. 6d.

THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION.

By G. F. S. Gray. (S.P.C.K.) 180 pp. Cloth 12s. 6d. Paper 7s. 6d.

The most widely read book of Lambeth year is, of course, the official report. Outstanding among the other Lambeth books is Stephen Neill's *Anglicanism*. It is hoped that Penguin Books will not allow it to go out of print too quickly and that in due course another publisher will be allowed to bring out an edition with stiff covers. This book is a history of the Church of England, and more than a history, for the author moves easily from history to theology and liturgy. In the three brief paragraphs on the meaning of justification (pp. 48, 49) there is to be found one of the clearest expositions of the doctrine the reviewer has yet come across: it could almost be transferred as it stands to the *Theological Word Book* or the *Vocabulary of the Bible*. When Bishop Neill is discussing liturgical principles, the making of Prayer Books, or Prayer Book revision, he writes with the same attractive mastery.

Having told the story of the English Church from its genesis to the end of the nineteenth century, Bishop Neill proceeds to describe its expansion in the English speaking world and its missionary work in other areas. This leads on to a consideration of the earlier Lambeth Conferences and Anglican relations with other churches within and without the Ecumenical Movement. An interesting chapter on "Present Positions and Future Prospects" leads into the final chapter, "What then is Anglicanism?"

Most of the book is devoted to historical writing, and very good history it is too. On the missionary movement and the place of Anglicanism in the world-wide Church, Bishop Neill writes with acknowledged authority, but he seems equally at home with the history of the Church in this country. His bibliography suggests the extent of his reading and his text shows how well he has digested what he has read, so that he may place his own account tersely, but engagingly, before his readers. Of course he has left himself open to criticism in

several places. One book that seems to have escaped his notice is Dean Malden's *English Church and Nation*, and with it Malden's important point that the Church of England owes much to Henry VIII for his strengthening of the episcopate after the suppression of the monasteries, thus making it possible for episcopacy to work effectively. Some will find Bishop Neill's strictures on the establishment too severe, others will protest against his entirely unsympathetic treatment of Archbishop Laud. On the other hand, many will rejoice with the present reviewer that for Bishop Neill the Anglican *par excellence* is neither Hooker nor Andrewes nor Laud, but Thomas Cranmer. To Cranmer we owe the open Bible in our churches, our Prayer Book, and our Articles of Religion. To Cranmer we owe the Anglican attitude of mind to questions of doctrine and ceremonial. To put it in Bishop Neill's words: "Show us that there is anything clearly set forth in Holy Scripture that we do not teach and we will teach it. Show us that anything in our teaching or practice is clearly contrary to Scripture, and we will abandon it" (p. 417). One feels that Cranmer would have approved of the final chapter in which suggestions are made as to the ingredients of Anglicanism with the stress on Biblical and liturgical quality, its sense of continuity expressed through episcopacy, its stress on sound learning, tolerance, and truth, its appeal to the conscience, and its emphasis on personal saintliness and the glory of the pastoral ministry, and finally its ideal of comprehensiveness.

I greatly enjoyed D. L. Edwards' *Not Angels but Anglicans*. This is a useful book to recommend to a Nonconformist who is puzzled by the paradoxes of Anglicanism, but is unlikely to read as big a book as Bishop Neill's. Having explained the present situation of the Church of England with its various parties, he goes on to discuss episcopacy, the establishment, the parochial system, Anglican worship, and the place of the Church of England in the coming great Church. His writing is salted with wit and sweetened by tolerance. He is opposed to gaiters and would like bishops to be addressed as "Bishop", not as "My Lord". His attitude to episcopacy is that of *The Historic Episcopate*, that episcopacy is essential to the Church's fulness. His attitude both to dissenters and others, whose views differ from his own, is marked by a pleasing charity.

Mr. Gray's book, *The Anglican Communion*, is in two parts. Part I traces the growth of the Anglican Communion throughout the world. Part II deals with such questions as Anglicanism and the Bible, doctrine, worship, order, and organization and Christian unity. The first part is a useful supplement to Bishop Neill's three chapters on the same subject. Unfortunately Mr. Gray's writing has none of the attractive freshness of Bishop Neill's. In years to come many may be glad of it as a reliable reference book, but few are likely to read it from cover to cover, but doubtless in Lambeth year, when reliable information was required quickly and within brief compass, it served a useful purpose.

MICHAEL HENNELL.

EIGHTEENTH CENTURY CHURCH AND PEOPLE.

By S. C. Carpenter. (John Murray.) 290 pp. 35s.

The eighteenth century Church in England has come in for much hostile criticism during the present century, and not until the studies

of Dr. Norman Sykes and others has the period been viewed in a fair perspective. We now have another study by Dr. S. C. Carpenter to complete his trilogy of Church history covering the period from the arrival of the Roman mission under Augustine to *Lux Mundi*. As the author clearly indicates, this century was not a congenial one to him, but he has awarded praise where it was due, and has produced a comprehensive study of considerable value, varied by excursions into certain fields not always included in a work of this kind. Of particular interest, for example, is his chapter on Dr. Johnson and his friends, while in dealing with the Whig ascendancy we find a good deal of information on social and economic history.

In placing the beginning of the eighteenth century at 1689, Dr. Carpenter has followed the new and welcome tendency not to be confined within the superficial convenience of round figures or the span of a royal house (Professor Briggs' *The Age of Improvement* is another recent example), while 1789 was an obvious *terminus ad quem*. The Hanoverian Church brought about considerable changes in the ecclesiastical position, and these the author has dealt with in some detail, rightly estimating the importance of the initial trends which hardened into the traditional link between Church patronage and Whig politics during the period.

Episcopal appointments under the prevailing system might have been expected to produce more unworthy occupants of the Bench than was in fact the case. But an age which included Gibson, Butler, Berkeley, Secker, and Warburton should be remembered, even if it also inflicted on the Church the notorious Hoadly and Watson. Indeed, the reader may be surprised to hear that of all eighteenth century divines, Warburton is the one with whom the author would most have liked to converse, though later he states with emphasis that the "burning and shining light of the whole century was John Wesley". His treatment of the Methodist movement and of the Evangelicals is careful and discriminating, and it is of particular interest to find quoted the views on Wesley of Alexander Knox. In dealing with the position to-day, the wise comment is made that if the breach between Anglican and Methodist is to be healed, "it will not be by the re-absorption of an erring-daughter community by a complacent Anglican mother, but a union of two kindred traditions, preserving all that is of value in them both. This would be a great gain to both. The Methodists would lengthen our cords and the Church might strengthen their stakes" (p. 216).

In addition to a full treatment of the main theological controversies, consideration is given to the inferior clergy and to the country parson in the persons of Woodforde and Cole, with judicious sidelights from the diaries of lay observers such as Defoe, Celia Fiennes, and Lord Torrington, while other matters concerning church life, including tithes, architecture, music, and education, also receive due attention. Indeed, the value of this book rests very largely on the balance achieved by the author in his treatment of the many subjects which must be dealt with if a true picture of the period is to be obtained. Congratulations and gratitude are equally due to Dr. Carpenter for giving us this scholarly yet most readable volume.

G. C. B. DAVIES.

THE MAN OF TEN TALENTS : A PORTRAIT OF RICHARD CHEVENIX
TRENCH, 1807-86.

By J. Bromley. (S.P.C.K.) 253 pp. 25s.

It is certainly surprising that until this year, more than seventy years after his death, we have been without a biography of Archbishop Trench. This omission has been made good by the Rector of Theale, who in the book before us has provided a most able study, well written and well proportioned, of a man whose name, chiefly because of his writings, continues to be known and respected. Yet it must be confessed that, admirably though Mr. Bromley has performed his task, it was a disappointment to discover how essentially dull a person Archbishop Trench was. This dulness, which is all the more unexpected in view of the distinguished circle of his friends, seems to have been the consequence of a temperament that was natively morose and sombre, and that found characteristic expression in the composition of verses which, though published (some of them in *The Times*) and admired in his day, are overcast with gloomy moralizings and can without injustice be described as "insufferably tame" (which is how a by no means unfriendly reviewer of a volume of his poems said they would have been described had the volume appeared ten years before it did). The oblivion into which Trench's verse has now sunk is not unmerited.

Despite the advantages of excellent family connections and the endeavours of influential friends, it was only several months after his ordination, which took place in 1832, that a curacy was at last found for him—in the parish of Hadleigh, Suffolk, where he was not at all happy—so amply filled were the ranks of the clergy in those days ! The vicar with whom he served was one of the pioneers of the Tractarian movement, but Mr. Bromley tells us that Trench "was never a wholehearted 'Tractarian', and at no time had he the slightest sympathy with any attempt to exalt or imitate the Church of Rome", and that "his Anglicanism was firmly rooted in the Prayer Book". It is of interest to learn of the manner in which a visit to the Continent in 1834 impressed upon his mind the difference between a Sunday there and "the holy calm of an English sabbath". "When a nation gives up the sabbath," he wrote, "it gives up, as a nation at least, having any religion ; for it is the observance of Sunday which keeps up a people to that recognition of religious obligations which, though not themselves lifeful Christianity, are yet the preparation of the soil for the reception of it."

His first incumbency was that of Curdridge, and this was followed by his appointment to the benefice of Itchenstoke. In 1846 he became Professor of Divinity at King's College, London, while still continuing as Vicar of Itchenstoke. Ten years later he accepted nomination as Dean of Westminster, and then on January 1st, 1864, at the age of fifty-six, he was consecrated Archbishop of Dublin. His tenure of the archiepiscopal see was not free from storms and stresses, especially as it fell to his lot to pilot the Irish Church through the crisis of disestablishment and the difficult years of reconstruction that followed.

Trench's scholarship was competent rather than brilliant. He was

well versed in the writings of the Fathers and had a particular predilection for Augustine, and his *Notes on the Parables* (1841) and *Notes on the Miracles* (1846) continue to be of value to the expounder of the New Testament. His lively and lifelong interest in words and their meaning led to his becoming a prominent member of the Philological Society and to the publication of works such as *The Study of Words* (1851), *The Synonyms of the New Testament* (1854 and 1863), and *Some Deficiencies in our English Dictionaries* (1857). Indeed, in the Preface and Historical Introduction to no less a work than *The Oxford New English Dictionary* it is acknowledged that "the history of this Dictionary goes back to Nov. 1857, when Richard Chevenix Trench, then Dean of Westminster, by calling attention to the deficiencies of existing English dictionaries, encouraged the Philological Society to make plans for the compilation of a new English dictionary".

Apart from the questionable value of the title of this volume as a title for a biography, it would, we believe, be more just to describe Archbishop Trench as a man of five rather than ten talents.

PHILIP E. HUGHES.

THE LITURGICAL MOVEMENT AND THE LOCAL CHURCH.

By Alfred R. Shands. (S.C.M.) 126 pp. 8s. 6d.

The author is a young episcopal minister in the U.S.A. who spent a year visiting churches of many denominations in England, Scotland, France, and America, to study their methods of "mission to society". He discovered an exciting revival centred round a liturgical movement. The movement is described as a growing demand for catholicity. It expresses penitence over the splintering of the Church since the Reformation. It is claimed to be of the Holy Spirit. It is at the same time completely Catholic and Evangelical. "The Body of Christ is above all liturgical."

We can wholeheartedly admire the sincerity of the author and approve many of his aims, such as his passionate desire to make religion real both to the outsider and to the regular worshipper. He advocates a greater use of the laity and desires that they should be able to "talk about the Gospel". He encourages the idea of the "house-church". He would have us examine the worship of the Church to ensure its sincerity. His honesty is seen in some interesting conclusions about the service of Holy Communion. He thinks the priest should be less in evidence: that we should recover the conception of a meal: that true symbolism demands certain changes, such as a loaf instead of wafers and an unrobed choir sitting with the people.

All this is excellent, but unless the doctrine of the eucharist is truly biblical a new liturgical movement could be sterile. It could even be deadly, serving only to provide disillusioned clergy with a new interest, and to hide under a false veneer our failure to fulfil the true mission of "ambassadors". It could, and does, in the wrong hands drive lifelong worshippers out of the Church into Nonconformity or "non-churchgoing".

The vision of this book appears to be that of a Church offering eucharistic worship on behalf of the parish. The evangelism which reaches people one by one, bringing them to the experience of a new

creation, seems outmoded. "The Church will have to learn how to fish with 'neither a line nor a net, but rather change the water in the pond'." Is this a true biblical conception?

"The liturgy is the heart of the matter." But is it? The Cross is the heart of the matter, and unless the Cross is in the heart of the worshipper the liturgy will be meaningless to him. A campaign to make people believe that salvation lies in the liturgy cannot be described as spreading the Gospel.

We cannot wax enthusiastic over the statement that the minister offers three sacrifices—the sacrifice of Christ in the liturgy, the sacrifice of his people, and the sacrifice of himself. Nor can we accept the view that "the minister is the congregation's way of access to God".

Unity of worship seems to be unduly stressed; surely true unity transcends forms of worship. Again there appears to be an undue glorification of a corporate worship judged by numbers, we might almost call it bulk-worship. The "Early Service" is criticized because it is so often a few people scattered about the church. The focus is set rather upon the *act* of worship than upon Christ, and upon the number of the worshippers rather than upon the quality of their worship.

The liturgical movement in the Roman Church tends towards the simplicity which the Reformation gave us, but in our own Church it is away from simplicity and the Reformers. Are we to meet the Roman Catholic at a point where we have outward unity?

While we thank God for the sincere desire in this book to find a new way of approach to evangelism and to worship in spirit and in truth, we cannot feel that the liturgical movement as set forth here is the satisfactory answer to our contemporary problems.

T. G. MOHAN.

IRRELIGIOUS REFLECTIONS ON THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

By Werner Pelz. (S.C.M.) 128 pp. 8s. 6d.

The publishers describe this work as "an attack on conventional Christianity by a parish priest who knows his responsibility for the life of the Church". There is nothing particularly irreligious about it and its challenge would generally meet with our approval, though we might not always accept the grounds upon which it is made. The author insists that "we are here to preach", and that the Cross should be the centre of our preaching: that the Bible judges us and not we the Bible. The "rhythm of the Bible" is traced through the Old Testament introducing us to the New Testament doctrine of the Grace of God. We are warned of the prevalent danger of wanting to be like the "God" of our own creation. The dogma that man is free because he can choose between good and evil is rejected; he is free only when he submits to the bondage of Christ and when the love of Christ constrains him. The Church is "elected" to become a witness to Jesus Christ and it is in its fundamental unreadiness to become what it is that the nature of "election" is revealed. Faith, too, is judged by the same standard. It can so easily degenerate into "opinion"; faith is a gift of God whereby we respond to His grace. Hope, which again is God's gift and should be only the hope of Christ's

return in triumph, is often corrupted into "ambition". Most of our teaching about love is "impudent" because it is governed by convention. Sin is not the offence of which we are guilty but the radical "something" in us which makes us commit the offence; the author calls it unbelief, but is it not disobedience—rebellion?

The author is ruthless in smashing ecclesiastical idols but he does not quite succeed in convincing us that he has put the right thing in their place. This is, in part, because he is rather "wordy" and obviously enjoys wrapping up what he has to offer in modern jargon. For example, he describes the Church as "the first down-payment of the all-for-nothing in the topsy-turvy hire-purchase system of the foolishness of God's grace". Here is modern idiom with a vengeance, but is it any easier to understand than the language of the Bible? There are many who will enjoy this critique of the Church and find it stimulating, but there will also be those who will resent its fearless exposure of the distortion of Biblical truth to be found in much of our thinking and practice.

T. G. MOHAN.

GREAT VENTURE: THE CHURCH OF SOUTH INDIA IN ACTION.

By A. H. Dammers. (*The Highway Press.*) 62 pp. 2s. 6d.

These jottings by an English missionary who served a short term of four years with the Church of South India are full of interest. As one who has visited South India four times during the past sixteen years, both before and after the "great venture" was launched, your reviewer can testify that Mr. Dammers conveys most skilfully the atmosphere of the country, and of the groups of Christians with various denominational backgrounds gradually growing together, and assimilating to their mutual benefit some of the strong points of each. The process is still continuing. The Liturgy of the Church of South India, however, while it "is making its way on its own merits, particularly in the areas where the Church was formerly Methodist, Presbyterian, or Congregational", is used so little in the former Anglican areas that, according to Mr. Dammers, a majority of Church members have probably never heard of the service. He himself, though an Anglican, introduced the method of the Methodist Class Meeting to the staff of St. John's College, Palamcottah, all—to use Mr. Dammers' terminology—"Anglican-plus". A dull uniformity has never been the objective, but one is left with the impression that the "Methodist-plus" and the "Congregationalist-plus" are more appreciative of the Anglican heritage than the Anglicans are of theirs.

There is no attempt to exaggerate the very substantial success of the experiment. There are numerous groups of Christians which, for various reasons—not necessarily doctrinal—have maintained their independence of the Church of South India. Nor has the fusion of Anglicans, Congregationalists, Presbyterians, and Methodist *of itself* resulted in a very significant advance of the Gospel. Christians remain a tiny minority and, generally speaking, tend to be too ready to live happily side by side with Hindus and Muslims, if they are allowed to do so. Is it partly because they are insufficiently conscious of the uniqueness of the Gospel, and of the Satanic powers which hold their

brethren in bondage, and lull the Christians themselves into unconcern for the millions who are dying without Christ?

Mr. Dammers is convinced that missionaries from overseas are still required in the Church of South India. Nor is it only experts, whether in theology, medicine, or any other science, who are needed. "There is at least as great a need for ordinary people with a modest gift for affection, courage, and interest in people and things." "The overseas missionary often is, and should be, very much in the background today." Endued with the Spirit of power and love and self-discipline, he has a contribution to make which God can bless and the Church will welcome.

FRANK HOUGHTON, Bishop.

WHAT IS CHRISTIAN GIVING?

By Brian Rice. (S.C.M.) 96 pp. 7s. 6d.

The author of this little book (one of a series published by the S.C.M. and entitled "Studies in Ministry and Worship") is serving a curacy in England. Prior to his ordination, through a scholarship awarded by the World Council of Churches, he had the opportunity of spending a year in the United States at a Theological Seminary of the Protestant Episcopal Church. Convinced that "finance was a great problem" in the Church of England, he was deeply interested in discovering how the Churches of America compared with our own in regard to their standard of Christian giving.

His first week-end in the U.S.A., spent with the minister of a "downtown church" just outside New York, provided shocks from which Mr. Rice has never fully recovered, for the impressions gained there were confirmed by a host of similar—if not quite so startling—examples of Christian giving in the year that followed. Quite rightly, he has set himself the task of comparing "The American Scene" with "The English Scene", seeking to discover whether there are any basic reasons why our standard of giving is, generally speaking, so much lower than theirs, and whether the methods used in America would work in this country. Quite rightly, again, while he uses the Pauline method of stirring us to emulation by the story of what is being done over there, he is more concerned (as St. Paul was) that we should re-discover the scriptural principles of Christian giving, and do what God expects of us.

In the particular church referred to (p. 13) nearly 1,000 people were present at the Sunday morning service, and the collection amounted to the equivalent of £900—the weekly average! Mr. Rice does not say what specific methods had been used to arrive at such a striking result. Indeed, the methods vary, but it appears to be universally accepted that Christian people require training in Christian giving. "People give, not as they are able, but as they understand" (p. 26).

The Bishop of Michigan, in a sober Foreword, makes this important observation: "We should teach Modern Tithing because it is right, serious and responsible, not because it is successful. It springs from gratitude to God, and is a means of grace that leads us closer to Him."

The challenge of the facts and arguments of this book is primarily to Christians, most of whom are giving far less than they imagine. "Begging from outsiders may bring in more money, but this is not

Christian giving." It is not only in America that twenty-five per cent of churchgoers give eighty per cent of the budget (p. 44). And, if we were to adopt the principle of giving "a grateful share" of our income to God's work, we too should discover that "the *primary result* of Tithing is in the changing of human lives" (p. 50).

FRANK HOUGHTON, Bishop.

A PRACTICAL VIEW.

By William Wilberforce. (S.C.M.) 120 pp. 9s. 6d.

Happily we live in a day of reprints! And this is a very important matter when one recalls that so many books were lost during the war either by being burnt, or pulped, and that so many have, during the past fifty years, gone to the States! This makes us all the more grateful to Hugh Martin for undertaking the editorship of a series called "A Treasury of Christian Books". In this series, by the way, can be found Bunyan's *Grace Abounding*, Baxter's *Reformed Pastor*, a Selection of Samuel Rutherford's *Letters*, and other Christian classics. It is all the more gratifying to see Wilberforce's masterpiece because it has been so hard to come by.

Apart from the substance of the book, it is interesting to see that Wilberforce addresses himself to the "Higher and Middle Classes", and that it first appeared in 1797—a significant year! It was just at this time that the French Revolution was "cooking", and this helps us to see the wisdom of the remark of the Irish historian, W. H. Lecky, that the Evangelical Revival saved us from "a catastrophe similar to the French Revolution". Inevitably the book has been shortened, but nothing vital has been lost, as a comparison with early editions will show. The style of eighteenth century writers was more florid and expansive than at present.

The thesis of this book, which Wilberforce called his Manifesto, may be summed up in the word "Inadequacy". He shows the danger of inadequate conceptions concerning the importance of Christianity, concerning the corruption of human nature, concerning our Saviour and the Holy Spirit . . . etc. And, in every case, against such a background, he presents the truth with a persuasiveness which grips and enthral. The book is a true reflection of the man, "the life blood of a master-spirit".

It is a grand thing that two hundred years after his birth (1759) we should be able to turn to such a book as this, so tastefully produced and well printed. Wilberforce led a very reckless life until he was twenty-five, when he was brought to God after deep conviction of sin. The change in his life was so great that his mother thought his mind was giving way! But he was still so cheerful, and happy, and lovable, that a lady said, "If this be madness, I hope he will bite us all!"

One hopes that the reproduction of this famous book will have wide repercussions. An old story will reveal its influence in the past. Richard Sibbes, the Puritan, wrote a little book entitled *The Bruised Reed*. This helped Richard Baxter, whose *Call to the Unconverted* brought Philip Doddridge to Christ. Doddridge's book, *The Rise and Progress of Religion*, read while crossing Europe, awakened and transformed William Wilberforce, whose great book is now under review.

This, in turn, awakened Thomas Chalmers to the greatness of eternity, and so, too, Legh Richmond: "A change was effected . . . he felt a conviction of his own state as a guilty and condemned sinner, and under that conviction he sought mercy at the Cross of the Saviour" (*Life of Legh Richmond*, p. 25). May there be similar results in our own generation from a perusal of this reprint.

M. GUTHRIE CLARK.

PROPHET AND WITNESS IN JERUSALEM: A STUDY OF THE TEACHING OF ST. LUKE.

By Adrian Hastings. (Longmans.) 200 pp. 16s.

This is a book of considerable interest. It is by a young Roman Catholic scholar, apparently a missionary in Uganda. Its origin is revealed by the (to us) unusual spelling of words like "Zachary" and "Naim" and by the use, with small variations, of Ronald Knox's translation. Apart from this I doubt if even an experienced critic could have told that it was written from within the Roman obedience. Not only are Anglican and Free Church scholars freely quoted (the Archbishop of York with warm approval), but the theology itself is remarkably "evangelical". Take, for example, the final sentences: "The Father has sent the Son to die for us, and the Holy Spirit into our hearts for repentance and the forgiveness of sins. This is the thread which runs through the whole texture of Luke's work and makes sense of it all . . . the end, purpose, and meaning of it all is no other than this, that in Jesus Christ salvation has been offered to all men, and to all peoples by the loving mercy of their God."

The literary exposition of Luke and Acts is extremely fresh and interesting. Like most up-to-date scholars, Hastings has abandoned the view that St. Luke is a "simple" historian telling beautifully a plain story in rather humanitarian terms. Instead he believes that St. Luke is a subtle theological teacher, always aware of the typological overtones of his story.

His particular emphasis is on the presentation of the Gospel against the background of Jerusalem—not just the geographical city so-called, but Jerusalem as it stands in the divine history—the "holy-unholy city". Much of which one has been vaguely aware he brings to a clear and challenging light. He shows that the failure of Jerusalem to receive the Gospel was the reason why Jerusalem was the starting point of the great missionary story of Acts, "beginning at Jerusalem".

He believes that Our Lord's Messiahship is presented in terms of His Mission as Prophet (and Suffering Servant) and that St. Paul takes up as "witness" the task begun (and in some sense finished) by "the great prophet which had risen up".

Other interesting chapters—rather more fanciful—appear on Theophilus, and Joanna, the wife of Chusa. And there is a splendid chapter on "the Exodus" which Christ accomplished at Jerusalem.

The revival in Roman Catholicism of such genuine Bible study (believe me, with no strings on it) is one of the really hopeful signs in ecumenical Christendom.

RONALD LEICESTER.

CONVERSIONS PSYCHOLOGICAL AND SPIRITUAL.

By D. Martyn Lloyd-Jones. (I.V.F.) 40 pp. 2s.

Dr. William Sargant, a practising psychiatrist, in his book *The Battle of the Mind* has caused considerable uneasiness amongst thoughtful Christians by the comparison which he draws between the modern technique of "brainwashing" and the experience of conversion—with special reference to methods of evangelism. He ascribes both to physiological changes in the brain, which have been demonstrated experimentally in both animals and men. He illustrates his argument by an examination of the records of the Day of Pentecost in Acts ii, the conversion of St. Paul, and the conversion and subsequent preaching of John Wesley.

In *Conversions, Psychological and Spiritual* we have the substance of an address given by Dr. Martyn Lloyd-Jones to Christian ministers, providing certain answers to the dangerous thesis. First, it is freely admitted that much of what Dr. Sargant has written is indisputable; and that good ideas as well as bad, religious as well as secular, can be psychologically implanted in a mind previously conditioned to receive them. But two fundamental points are made. The first is, that the Christian faith is not a philosophy to be imbibed, but is firmly based upon assured historical facts—the most important of which is the literal resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead. The second is that no place is found in Dr. Sargant's system for the person and work of the Holy Spirit. In the first we have the only possible explanation of something which Dr. Sargant has completely ignored—the transformation of the discouraged and disappointed disciples into the bold convinced believers they suddenly became. And only the sovereign will of God by the operation of the Holy Spirit can account for the rapid progress of the early Church, for the revivals of history as well as for the conversion of countless sinners all down the ages, of all types and races.

But perhaps one of the most important sections of this short essay is that which deals with the lessons which may be learned from this book by those who seek to win others for Christ. Our message and methods must both alike be based upon New Testament principles. We should examine afresh our techniques, lest we be really guilty of producing a psychological condition for the involuntary acceptance of the message we are proclaiming. The closing paragraph is a challenge to a concentration upon earnest prayer "for a visitation of God's Holy Spirit both upon the church and upon ourselves as individuals. . . . Not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord of hosts."

DESMOND K. DEAN.

MORAL EDUCATION IN CHRISTIAN TIMES.

By E. B. Castle. (George Allen & Unwin.) 396 pp. 30s.

"Train up a child in the way he should go: and when he is old, he will not depart from it." The oft-quoted Scriptural maxim, true though it is, does not throw much light on the problem of *how* to train a child in the way he should go. The Bible does have a good deal to say about this in other places, however, both in the Old and New Testaments, and much of this teaching has passed into our own

traditions of moral education, in home, school, and church. We in this country should be profoundly thankful for everything in our social and educational system that comes from Christian principles, and this fascinating book shows how much in fact, even in this "post-Christian" age, has been shaped by Christian tradition. It is a perfectly straightforward account of the history of moral education—the training of the young in standards of conduct and behaviour. It must be confessed that to the reviewer a book of nearly 400 pages on such a subject did not make an immediate appeal. But after reading a few chapters he could wholeheartedly agree with the publisher's blurb: "On no account must you miss this book. It is tremendous fun."

The writer, who is Professor of Education at Hull University, has an easy style, and presents his facts readably and attractively. He traces the subject back to its Jewish foundations, examines the teaching of St. Paul and the practice of the early Church, continues with the teaching of the Fathers, the Middle Ages, the Reformers, the nineteenth century, Public Schools, and modern "free expression" educationalists, and has a final chapter on schools to-day. Far from being dull, all this is "tremendous fun".

Moral education, the training of the young, is, without doubt, a vitally important matter—perhaps more than ever in our own time. Much good advice is given on this subject by many people, but for anyone who is prepared to devote the time to it, a study of what has been done in the past, of the successes and failures of parents and teachers in days gone by, will provide a sound criterion to judge present trends, and a solid basis for an effective Christian approach to the moral training of young people to-day. And it will also be, thanks to Professor Castle, a pleasant task.

R. F. THOMAS.

THE HUMAN SITUATION. THE GIFFORD LECTURES OF 1935-1937.

By W. Macneile Dixon. (*Penguin Books.*) 443 pp. 5s.

These Gifford Lectures on the subject "Why are we here?" must be one of the most notable series of lectures delivered in recent years, and Penguin Books have done a great service in reprinting them at such a reasonable price. They are worth reading, not only for their argument, but for the sheer beauty of their prose. Perhaps "argument" is the wrong word, for the author does not argue. His method is to take us gently and courteously through our inner and outer worlds, and lead us to stop and wonder at the mysteries that meet us on every hand. Whether or not we agree with all that is said, we are left with a profound reverence for life and a fresh awareness that there are no slick answers.

The book moves backwards and forwards through history, philosophy, biology, evolution, the will to live, morality, the nature of time, psychology, and parapsychology. In the earlier part of the book Professor Dixon shows the limitations of the physical sciences. "Science is in a dilemma, revolving in a closed circle, and by her own choice left without an alternative" (p. 160). He amplifies this: "There is no scale in physics for determining, let us say, the value of a poem, or the aspirations of a saint. . . ." Similarly he cannot find

entire satisfaction in evolution : " The origin of species, the history of life, is one thing, but what is life itself, the breath of existence, in which all are sharers ? " (p. 123).

What then is this universe and the life that is in it ? The chapters on The One and the Many, and that entitled Once upon a Time, grapple with the perennial problem of the Unity in relation to the separate units, and on the whole Professor Dixon finds it more helpful to begin with the monads in relation to one another, and to leave the nature of God undefined. Remember that he is arguing as a philosopher, albeit a very practical philosopher. As such he is convinced that man is more than a material being, and will survive the death of the body. The Christian who accepts special revelation will naturally want to say more than this book says, but it is fascinating to see how far a reasonable thinker can go when he gets out of a specialist rut and views the created order as a whole.

J. STAFFORD WRIGHT.

VISIONS OF THE END : A STUDY IN DANIEL AND REVELATION.

By Adam C. Welch. (James Clarke.) 258 pp. 12s. 6d.

This is a posthumous edition of a work first published to help ex-service ordinands in 1922. If it leads you to anticipate lurid interpretations of Danielic " Beasts " and Johannine " Trumpets ", the title is misleading. The author regarded his original book as a " modest effort " suited to the kind of ordinand who had heard of Dr. Charles's recent volumes, but would never read them. Ordinands certainly haven't changed in this respect, and neither has the 1958 edition. It remains a simple introduction to apocalypse in general and to Daniel and Revelation in particular.

So regarded it is a remarkably competent job ; for the author manages to pack every paragraph with lucid closely reasoned argument. He was obviously reared in the Liberalism of the 'twenties. He ascribes the first seven chapters of Daniel to the Exile, the last five to c. 165 B.C., and holds the resultant document to be a pseudonymous prophecy. For Revelation he is content to follow Charles's view that the author was John the Prophet writing under Domitian.

He dismisses rigorously any theory that the Danielic visions describe the distant future. They are attempts to reconcile the blasphemies and crimes of Antiochus with belief in an overruling Providence. They are not typical apocalyptic ; for the judgments of God which constitute the birth-pangs of Messiah are missing. In John's visions he must of necessity recognize future themes—those of the millenium and the resurrection. The former, bound up as it is with the traditional earthly Jewish kingdom, he regards as only a temporary feature, not essential to the Christian faith. John's real contribution is to rescue and preserve the tradition of bodily resurrection, as opposed to the Hellenistic immortality of the soul.

Much of the Liberalism which the writer took for granted in 1922 has since been challenged. Vital discoveries have now underlined the importance of the extra-canonical apocalypses for a true understanding of Daniel and Revelation. Even so, this book remains a very able introduction for students and preachers in this generation, just as it was formerly.

D. H. TONGUE.

THE DATE OF EZRA'S COMING TO JERUSALEM AND THE BUILDING OF THE SECOND TEMPLE.

By J. Stafford Wright. (Tyndale Press.) 32 and 20 pp. respectively. 1s. 6d. each.

Since it became fashionable to decry traditional views of the Old Testament, critical reconstructions of the history have acquired an aura of sanctity which makes them resistant to further investigation. Believing this to have happened in the case of the chronological sequence of Ezra and Nehemiah, Mr. Stafford Wright took as his subject for the 1947 Tyndale Lecture "the date of Ezra's coming to Jerusalem". First published in that same year, this has now been reprinted in a revised form which takes into account the comments of reviewers and others who have made reference to it, notably Professor H. H. Rowley. Mr. Wright ably maintains his position and shows that the traditional view, which believes that Ezra and Nehemiah arrived in Jerusalem in the seventh and twentieth years respectively of Artaxerxes I, king of Persia (464-424 B.C.), agrees better with the known data than the view of C. C. Torrey and others that "Ezra" was a creation of the Chronicler who wanted a priestly figure to offset the civil leader Nehemiah, or that of L. W. Batten in the International Critical Commentary by which it is stated that the king in whose reign Ezra arrived was really Artaxerxes II (404-359 B.C.) and not Artaxerxes I. The prominent position of two such men in a small, close-knit community such as that of post-exilic Judaism militates against any theory of their being wrongly dated by the Chronicler 150 years later, even if our records "show so little trace of any real contact between the two men" demanded by the traditional view.

Another problem raised by the post-exilic period is that of the date of the building of the Second Temple. According to Ezra iii. 8ff., the foundation stone was laid very soon after the return under Zerubbabel and Joshua, namely, in 536 B.C.; but in Haggai ii. 15-18 it is implied that the stone was laid in 520 B.C. by Zerubbabel and Joshua. Was Zerubbabel actually in Jerusalem sixteen years before? If so, how are we to account for the mention of Sheshbazzar as the leader of the returned exiles in Ezra i. 8? Were Zerubbabel and Sheshbazzar the same person? When did the building really begin? These and kindred questions formed the subject of a further lecture given by Mr. Wright under the Tyndale Foundation at Cambridge in 1952 and now published by the I.V.F. under the title *The Building of the Second Temple*. Both these pamphlets should be carefully studied by those who are troubled by critical reconstructions and who wish to have a clear statement of conservative lines of defence presented in a reasonable and scholarly manner.

L. E. H. STEPHENS-HODGE.

MARRIAGE WAS MADE FOR MAN. A STUDY OF THE PROBLEM OF MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE IN RELATION TO THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

By A. P. Shepherd. (Methuen.) 112 pp. 8s. 6d.

In this book the regulations concerning marriage and divorce, promulgated as an Act of Convocation of Canterbury on October 1st, 1957, come under critical scrutiny. Canon Shepherd is concerned at

the rigorist point of view which seems to be gaining acceptance in high places in the Church of England regarding the pastoral control of those members of the Church whose marriage has been broken by divorce, and who wish to marry again. He writes to point a "more excellent way", theologically sound, more humane, and more likely to succeed.

Under the present regulations remarriage in church is refused while a former partner is alive, and permission to receive Holy Communion is at the discretion of the diocesan bishop. This is criticized because it ignores the exceptive clause of St. Matthew and the spiritual rights of the genuinely innocent party, and also because it is illegal. The doctrine that marriage is *absolutely* indissoluble cannot be proved from the New Testament. The texts which are assumed to prove indissolubility are carefully analysed. The teaching of our Lord and St. Paul explicitly declares "that neither partner in a marriage had the right, of their own will to dissolve it". This is the real meaning of the phrase, "Whom God hath joined together let no man put asunder". It will not do to ignore the exceptive clause—for fornication.

An alternative approach to discipline in this matter is given. In effect it would mean that the Church would not normally admit any to a second marriage who had not sought the Church's help at the *beginning* of the break-up. The book finishes with a philosophy of sex as it appears in man. Man is spirit. He is a rational and moral being. His spiritual nature transforms his physical nature. God made them male and female. Love is the search not only for self-fulfilment in the other but for self-giving to the other.

This short book is written with such burning conviction, clear thinking, and moral persuasiveness that it will repay study and give pause to those who might imagine that the prevailing laxity in sexual moral standards can be healed only by a rigorous legalism which is alien to the spirit of the Christian Gospel.

A. V. M'CALLIN.

TOWARDS CHRISTIAN MARRIAGE.

By W. Melville Capper and H. Morgan Williams. (I.V.F.)
pp. 144. 3s. 6d.

This little handbook, originally published more than ten years ago under the title *Heirs Together*, continues to be much in demand, and many thousands of copies have been sold. The authors are men of repute in their own field, as well as earnest and convinced Christians; whilst the addition of a chapter by Mrs. Dorothy Watts, giving the woman's point of view, helps to preserve the necessary balance. The experiences through which younger people pass as part of their development are wisely and sanely treated: friendship and love, marriage and the denial of marriage, discipline in the sex life as well as sexual disorders. Warnings are explicit but not overdone, and helpful advice is given to those who have been disappointed in the desire to be married. The guidance along medical lines is at once informed and informative.

The spiritual message cannot be missed, for it runs through the book and crops up in all sorts of places. This perhaps is something which has been overlooked in similar books containing so much that is good. Not only Christian marriage, but the Christian life in all circumstances, is clearly set forth. The necessity for the New Birth is plainly stated,

and the way of victory over all forms of temptation. The call is sounded for every believer to submit daily to the love and obedience of Christ. It is just the kind of book to instruct, help, and inspire, the younger men and women of our churches and Christian fellowships.

DESMOND K. DEAN.

THE GOSPEL OF THE INCARNATION.

By G. S. Hendry. (S.C.M.) 174 pp. 15s.

This is a most readable and profitable book worthy of serious study, not least by Anglicans, although written by an American Presbyterian of Scottish extraction. Originally delivered as the Croall Lectures for 1951 in New College, Edinburgh, they are now sent forth to the English speaking world with a message addressed to the churches concerning theology. The study deals with the complaint that the incarnation as a subject has not received much attention in the Reformed tradition, but is chiefly a preserve of Anglican theology. The author is concerned at the preoccupation of particular churches with the fragmentation of the Gospel and regards it as the underlying cause of our unhappy divisions. He is convinced that the ecumenical movement has a theological task before it, namely, the recovery of the wholeness of the Gospel, especially as controversy on specific issues is not the only cause of division, but rather the partialities and deficiencies in our apprehension of the Gospel. The revival of biblical theology is doing much to open up the road to reconciliation.

Professor Hendry concentrates on the nature of a Christian's communion with Christ. To what degree is it rooted in history? It is regrettable that he has pursued his theme in relation to Herrmann and not to Rudolf Bultmann, whose name is only mentioned once. The Gospel is firmly anchored in the incarnate life of Christ. In what way, he asks, since the different traditions answer this question in different ways? Often one tradition is nothing more than a revolt against another tradition, for example, German pietism against Lutheran orthodoxy and Reformed biblicism. There is a tension in Protestantism between piety and orthodoxy, between undue emphasis on religious experience on the one hand and correct doctrine on the other. The fragmentation of the Gospel is most obvious, however, between "Catholic" and "Protestant" conceptions of the Gospel. The Eastern Church comes under review especially as it has stressed the incarnational aspect more than any other body. Perhaps the fragmentation is most patent to us in the offset of incarnation against atonement in our doctrine of Christ and His work for man's salvation. A false antithesis is dangerously possible; both fundamentals are necessary for wholeness and power. Professor Hendry sets himself the task of reintegration of the twin concepts of incarnation and atonement by a close study of the Jesus of history, the humanity of Christ in Eastern theology, the humanity of Christ in Western theology, and the universality of Christ in modern theology. Then he deals carefully with the incarnate life of Jesus, expressing indebtedness to Denney, Forsyth, Mackintosh, Hodgson, and others for their contributions to the theme in hand. His most valuable point is the chapter on the living of forgiveness. The church which preaches this great theme

must also practise it. This is the weakness of contemporary Christianity.

The final chapter is an inquiry into the precise nature of the phrase, "the extension of the incarnation". If Christ is our great Contemporary, and yet is separated from us by space and time, in what way does He gulf the "ugly broad ditch" of the centuries? The Enlightenment movement cut the Gordian knot by severing faith from history as Bultmann has done. Protestantism postulates an infallible Book, and Rome an infallible Church. Calvin stressed not only the mystical union between Christ and His own, but their distinction which has to be recognized continually. No union of *essence* is possible. Gore is also given special mention as a mediating theologian. The Church is really a society of forgiven men and receives its forgiveness from Christ, and therefore can never succeed Him or inherit His office. The continuing life of Christ within the Church that makes Him contemporaneous is the work of the Holy Spirit. He promotes the mission of Christ in the world through committed men. By His aid the Church fulfils its ministry of "witness". In this way Christ is presented afresh to each successive generation. It is the kind of book some of us have been waiting for to answer basic problems in the present theological debate.

R. E. HIGGINSON.

A NEW QUEST OF THE HISTORICAL JESUS. (STUDIES IN BIBLICAL THEOLOGY, No. 25.)

By James M. Robinson. (S.C.M.) 128 pp. 9s. 6d.

This series of monographs is designed to provide clergy and laymen with the best work in biblical scholarship both in this country and abroad, but no one except an advanced student will appreciate what this book is all about. It is essentially a text-book outlining the present state of discussion in a limited field of New Testament studies, which to some will seem utterly irrelevant to modern needs. The introduction deals with the "Bultmannian" epoch in German theology and its consequence among Barthian devotees of seeking afresh the historical Jesus. The original quest has ended and a new one is about to begin. The first was a failure and the second may yield no more successful results, with the materials in hand for the investigation, and the method to be employed upon them. It is admitted on every hand that the historical method in vogue in the last century was deficient, and a new method is evoked which is more realistic, arising from a new concept of history and self. "This involves a positive appraisal of the kerygmatic nature of the Gospels" (p. 69). Dr. Robinson feels that the crucial fact of Jesus's understanding of Himself is still a possible subject of historical research. We may take leave to doubt it! Then follow chapters on the possibility of such a quest, its legitimacy, and its procedure. The whole business is beset by problems and opinions and counter-suggestions. There is no finality in this kind of research, and surprisingly enough no valid conclusions of spiritual worth. One is tempted to wonder whether God intended us to know so much about "the historical Jesus" lest we should cease to worship Him as God. We are told sufficient for faith to exist and to grow into maturity. Thus far has C. H. Dodd led

us to the kerygma—the preached Gospel—as the power by which the Church and the soul lives. The only redeeming feature of the new quest is the desire to rebut Bultmann's disturbing thesis that the soul can live on "myth", and historicity is not relevant for our purpose as Christians. With the New Testament in our hands we cannot accept this solution and are driven to provide an answer to its devastating effects on faith. This book deals with the attempt to provide it by scholars.

R. E. HIGGINSON.

NOTES ON SOME OTHER NEW BOOKS

Of making many books on the Dead Sea Scrolls there is no end, and some are beginning to find the study of them a weariness of the flesh. The significance and fascination of the Dead Sea Scrolls cannot be denied, however, and the making of books on them is to be welcomed rather than deprecated. We commend **A Guide to the Scrolls** by A. R. C. Leaney, R. P. C. Hanson, and J. Posen (S.C.M., 128 pp. 8s. 6d.) as a sensible and instructive *vade-mecum*. All three authors lecture in the Department of Christian Theology in the University of Nottingham, and Dr. Posen is a Jewish rabbi into the bargain. The authors are agreed in the following conclusions: "that the sect of the Scrolls was a Jewish sect belonging to the period about 140 B.C. to A.D. 70, that it regarded itself as strictly orthodox, and that it awaited the succour of God at a troubled time; further, that there is no ground whatever for the sensational announcements in book, newspaper, or broadcast, which suggest that the discoveries of these ancient manuscripts have rendered Christianity untenable".

From Germany comes a nobly produced book of illustrations of the Holy Land entitled **Zu Beiden Seiten des Jordans** by Hans Bardtke, who also writes a descriptive introduction (Union Verlag, Berlin, DM. 23.50). The pictures, sixty-seven in number, are photographs in colour finely reproduced on art paper. We have never seen better. They convey a first-class impression of the country in all its variety and would be of exceptional value to teachers of the history and geography of Palestine, as well as giving real pleasure and instruction to all who have an interest in the land where our Lord grew up and ministered. We believe that there would be an enthusiastic welcome for an edition of this excellent volume with an English text.

Two recent additions to the excellent and already extensive series of volumes published by George Allen and Unwin under the general designation of The Muirhead Library of Philosophy are, **The Philosophy of Whitehead** by W. Mays (259 pp., 25s.), and **The Problems of Perception** by R. J. Hirst (330 pp., 30s.). Mr. Mays' book is the fruit of his conviction "that Whitehead was not quite the Platonist that he had been made out", and "that a new interpretation of Whitehead's philosophy was necessary". In the main, he has given us a shrewd and careful commentary on the more important aspects of Whitehead's work, *Process and Reality*. Mr. Hirst offers a critical examination of various philosophies of perception and then develops a comprehensive hypothesis of his own against the background of the whole relation of mind and body.

Students of comparative religion will be pleased to know that a new translation by Edward Conze of a selection of **Buddhist Scriptures** has been published in the Penguin Classics series (250 pp., 3s. 6d.). In making his selection for this volume Mr. Conze has sought those passages which are readily intelligible, and in general has "preferred texts intended for laymen to those addressed to monks", on the assumption that the majority of his readers "live in the world, and are denied the benefits of monastic seclusion". Another volume of interest in this field is **Hinduism: Its Meaning for the Liberation of the Spirit**, by Swami Nikhilananda (George Allen and Unwin, 189 pp., 16s.), which is a new addition to the World Perspectives series.